# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-109
Thursday
6 June 1991

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-91-109* *6 June 1991*

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.


**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**United States & Canada**

Strauss Selection as Moscow Envoy Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 1
Bush Emphasizes 'Positive' Relations *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Jun]* ..... 1
Primakov, Shcherbakov U.S. Talks Evaluated *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jun]* ..... 1
U.S. Seen Moving Toward Accord on Credits *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* ..... 4

**West Europe**

Gorbachev Visit to Norway, Sweden Previewed *[Moscow International]* ..... 4
Brundtland Gives Pre-Gorbachev Visit Interview *[Moscow TV]* ..... 5
Gorbachev Visits Oslo To Accept Nobel Prize ..... 5
Makes Arrival Statement *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 5
Gorbachev, Brundtland Sign Declaration *[Moscow TV]* ..... 6
Text of Joint Declaration *[TASS]* ..... 6
Gorbachev, Brundtland Hold News Conference ..... 7
Gorbachev's Opening Remarks *[Moscow TV]* ..... 7
Says World 'Needs' Perestroyka *[Moscow TV]* ..... 8
Visit Reviewed; Bessmernykh Cited *[INTERFAX]* ..... 13
King Harold Hosts Dinner for Gorbachev ..... 14
Dinner Speeches Exchanged *[TASS]* ..... 14
Norwegian Photo Exhibit Honors Gorbachev *[TASS]* ..... 15
Shevardnadze Interviewed on New Book *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Jun]* ..... 15

**NATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**Supreme Soviet**

Supreme Soviet Debates Privatization Bill *[INTERFAX]* ..... 17
Debate Postponed For Improvements *[TASS]* ..... 17
Deputy Prime Minister Comments *[Moscow TV]* ..... 17
Supreme Soviet Discusses Its Possible Demise *[TASS]* ..... 18

**Political & Social**

Lukyanov on Upcoming London Trip, Union Treaty *[TASS]* ..... 19
Yakovlev Believes Republics Will Secede *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 4 Jun]* ..... 19
Deputies Split on Market Protection for Press *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* ..... 20
Responsibility for OMON Actions Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 30 May]* ..... 21
MVD on Necessity of Antiterrorism Units *[INTERFAX]* ..... 22
MVD Official Says Train Blast 'Planned Action' *[INTERFAX]* ..... 22
Validity of USSR Name Change Challenged *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* ..... 23
Presidential Decree To Protect Press Likely *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ..... 23
Officials Exploit Privatization in Kaliningrad *[Moscow TV]* ..... 23
Sobchak Urges Creation of Social Democratic Union *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 20]* ..... 24
Poll Reveals Ambivalence on Nuclear Weapons *[INTERFAX]* ..... 25

**Economic**

Shcherbakov Discusses Anticrisis Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Jun]* ..... 25
Aeroflot Faces Stiff Competition From Airlines *[INTERFAX]* ..... 27

Statistics Show Increasing Production Slump *[INTERFAX]* ..... 28
Westerners Can Participate in Privatization *[INTERFAX]* ..... 28
Government To License Oil, Gas Production *[INTERFAX]* ..... 28

**Agriculture**

Gorbachev, Nazarbayev Confer in Kokchetav *[IZVESTIYA 30 May]* ..... 29
Prime Minister Cited on Private, State Farming *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* ..... 30
Late-May Weather, Crop Status Reviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Jun]* ..... 30
Public Sector Potato, Vegetable Sowing Wanes *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* ..... 31

**Military**

U.S. Threat, Performance in Gulf War Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 May]* ..... 32
Volunteer Groups Formed for Transcaucasus Service *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* ..... 34
Exercise in Repulsing SLCM Attack Described *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 May]* ..... 34

**REGIONAL AFFAIRS**

**Baltic Republics**

Deputy Views Baltic Situation, Western Support *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 36
Latvian Leader Warns of Possible July Coup *[TASS]* ..... 36
Regional Procuracy Staff Assails RSFSR Move *[TASS]* ..... 37
Latvian Faction Sends Message to Gorbachev *[BALTFAX]* ..... 37
Latvian Parliament Passes New "Police Law" *[BALTFAX]* ..... 37
Latvian Paper on Investigation of OMON Actions *[BALTFAX]* ..... 37
RSFSR Prosecutor's Office Latvian Accord Deplored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* ..... 38
Residents 'To Take Up Duty' Outside Parliament *[Moscow TV]* ..... 38
Vilnius Commander Rejects Landsbergis Accusations *[TASS]* ..... 38
Officers Defend 3 Jun Vilnius Actions *[Moscow TV]* ..... 39
Landsbergis: Citizens 'Not Obliged' To Join Army *[PRAVDA]* ..... 39
Lithuanian Leader Warns of Military Action *[BALTFAX]* ..... 40
Lithuanian Economic Minister Interviewed *[EKHO LITVY 22 May]* ..... 40
Pope Meets Poland's Lithuanian Community *[TASS]* ..... 41

**RSFSR**

TASS Reviews 5 Jun Activities of RSFSR Candidates ..... 42
Yeltsin 'Instructions' on N. Ossetia, N. Caucasus *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 42
Yeltsin Tours Polluted Region Near Chelyabinsk *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 42
Yeltsin Orders Improved Law Enforcement *[INTERFAX]* ..... 43
Yeltsin Concessions on RSFSR KGB Assessed *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 20]* ..... 43
Chances of Yeltsin, Ryzhkov 'About Equal' *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* ..... 44
Yeltsin Running Mate Rutskoy Interviewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 31 May]* ..... 45
Views Siberian Campaign *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 46
Presidential Candidate Makashov Answers Questions *[Moscow TV]* ..... 47
Explains Views *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 22]* ..... 49
Tuleyev Views Strikes, Economic Program, Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 May]* ..... 50
On Reform of State Power *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 May]* ..... 52
Bakatin Running Mate Abdulatipov Interviewed *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ..... 53
Called 'Perceptive and Prestigious' *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 31 May]* ..... 54
Resolution on Election Observer Status Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 May]* ..... 55
Eleven Candidates for Moscow Mayor Registered *[IZVESTIYA 30 May]* ..... 55
Control Commission Objects to Leningrad Renaming *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ..... 56

**Western Republics**

Moldovan Citizens Denied USSR Citizenship *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 56
New Prime Minister Cited on Immediate Tasks *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jun]* ..... 56
Ex-Prime Minister Says He Was Removed by Moscow *[INTERFAX]* ..... 57

## Caucasus

Georgian Communists Complain of Harassment *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ..... 57
Shevardnadze Willing To Mediate Ethnic Dispute *[AFP]* ..... 58
Georgian President Offers Help *[INTERFAX]* ..... 58
Nagorno-Karabakh's Readiness for Dialogue Cited *[ARMENPRES]* ..... 58
Armenia's Sarkisyan on Party's Status, NKAO *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Jun]* ..... 58
Armenians Appeal to Nobel Committee for Help *[INTERFAX]* ..... 59
Armenian 'Combat' Damage Totals 50 Million Rubles *[TASS]* ..... 59

## United States & Canada

### Strauss Selection as Moscow Envoy Viewed

*LD060608- 91 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0730 GMT 6 Jun 91*

[Dispatch from New York by correspondent Sergey Levskoy]

[Text] The appointment of Robert Strauss, according to U.S. political circles, is unambiguous evidence of the White House's desire to support perestroyka and to strengthen bilateral relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. At the ceremony to present the new ambassador, President George Bush stated that he is confident of the correctness of his choice. In his words, Robert Strauss's contacts in the highest U.S. political quarters and his knowledge of the United States are a guarantee that the two ships, the United States and the USSR, will not pass each other by out of lack of understanding. Bush recognized that the appointment of Strauss has coincided with a crucial period of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Why did the U.S. President choose Democrat Robert Strauss, leaving aside a whole range of professional diplomats and sovietologists? As political observers are remarking, the appointment of the Democrat was intended to demonstrate that the policy of perestroyka enjoys the support not just of the Republican administration, but also of the Democratic Party. The administration is pinning hopes for expansion of trade and economic ties with Moscow on Robert Strauss. The new U.S. ambassador is an experienced businessman and lawyer with wide ties in U.S. and international business circles. In the Carter administration, Strauss was the U.S. trade spokesman. Recently he has been working in a major law firm representing the interests of various companies.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker emphasized that the choice of Robert Strauss as new U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union is a big plus for relations between the two countries, which are developing positively.

### Bush Emphasizes 'Positive' Relations

*PM0506181991 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Jun 91 p 3*

[TASS reports under general heading: "Positive Changes"]

[Text] Washington, 5 Jun—President G. Bush, speaking in the White House in connection with the appointment [naznacheniye] of R. Strauss as new U.S. ambassador to the USSR, made a positive assessment of the state of relations between the two countries, and noted that the continue to cooperate successfully in the cause of establishing a new world order in the interests of all mankind. He emphasized that positive changes in East-West relations are taking place thanks to the "new democracies in East Europe and to USSR President Gorbachev." The head of the U.S. Administration expressed the hope that "the two important and big countries will not pass like ships in the night because of a lack of mutual understanding." G. Bush announced that the United States "is currently studying a series of ideas which are to facilitate the implementation of democratic reforms in the Soviet Union and changes in its economy."

U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, who also made a statement in connection with R. Strauss' appointment, noted that "relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are developing positively."

"Relations between the two countries are now much broader and deeper than, say, five years ago," Marlin Fitzwater, the U.S. president's press secretary, emphasized at a White House briefing today. "In the eighties our relations were determined primarily by arms control problems," he said. "Today there is no doubt about the fact that they include a much bigger number of spheres of cooperation." According to M. Fitzwater, efforts to settle the conflict in the Persian Gulf zone and the situation in the Near East as a whole, as well as the situation in Angola, Ethiopia, and other parts of the world, can serve as graphic examples of the two countries' successful cooperation. Relations between our countries have now acquired also 'an economic dimension,'" the U.S. President's press secretary noted.

#### Stop Press

Washington, 5 Jun—U.S. President George Bush notified Prime Minister John Major of Great Britain on Tuesday that the United States will not object to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's being invited to London next month to meet with the heads of the world's seven leading industrial countries. This was reported by THE WASHINGTON POST today, citing official British and U.S. representatives.

### Primakov, Shcherbakov U.S. Talks Evaluated

*PM0506144591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Report by correspondent V. Nadein: "Patience, Understanding, Loans"]

[Text] Washington—The visit to Washington by Ye.M. Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, and V.I. Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister, took place at a time when Soviet-U.S. relations have clearly improved. Events have acquired a high level of predictability, primarily in a positive sense.

Following General M. Moiseyev's visit it became clear that the sides' differences on the CFE Treaty would not persist long. This was confirmed last Sunday, when contentious problems were removed in Lisbon through the efforts of A.A. Bessmertnykh and J. Baker.

The adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the entry and exit law gave the U.S. Government formal grounds to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status in trade. However, the fact that the law is not being implemented in full immediately but only as of 1993 makes it possible for the White House to refrain from making a positive decision.

In other words, none of the administration's decisions contravened the Jackson-Vanik amendment—the ideal condition for checking fairness.

By the time that readers see these lines the White House decision on this subject will be known. Most observers agree that it will be positive and that the Jackson-Vanik amendment will be suspended with respect to the USSR for at least a year.

Finally, the question of the United States granting the Soviet Union a $1.5-billion loan for the purchase of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials is considered virtually a foregone conclusion. Until recently the problem had been considered as virtually intractable. The authorities made a tough show of listing the difficulties in the way of a loan—from the economic recession in the United States to the USSR's empty foreign exchange coffers.

However, in recent weeks there have been specific signs that even this step by the White House is entirely likely.

Nonetheless, one alarming feature connected with this summer's tough political timetable remains. Namely that the summits in Moscow (between the two nuclear superpowers) and London (between the seven Western industrialized countries) are potentially very productive—but precisely in that order. Merely switching these moves—London first, Moscow later—would seriously impede the adoption of measures that are important for the entire world. Because there is no more important question on the agenda of the "Big Seven" conference than extensive aid to the Soviet Union.

The United States is making no secret of what it sees as the main source of the growing harmony in bilateral relations. As regards the, now resolved, key point of the differences—the three Soviet ground divisions formerly transferred to the Marines—even here THE NEW YORK TIMES, for instance, sees a "strong signal that he (M.S. Gorbachev) wants to place at the center of attention something that really amounts to a question of life or death: economic aid from the West."

But diplomats are probably not supposed to express themselves so directly. At any rate, delegation head Ye.M. Primakov, answering an American reporter's question after the last meeting at the White House about what the Soviet Union needs most from the West, said:

"Patience first, understanding second."

Probably money is nonetheless needed most. However, it is clear that the main obstacle to obtaining that money could be Western impatience and misunderstanding. Ye. Primakov considered it expedient not to worry his interlocutors with specific figures. Incidentally, they already knew that it was a question of "megabucks" (USA TODAY)—$100 billion to $150 billion.

At current rates this is four times more than the entire "Marshall Plan" for aid to postwar Europe.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL has reported that "President Mikhail Gorbachev personally assured President Bush that Soviet envoys would bring a detailed economic reform plan with them."

The newspaper did not specify just what kind of plan was envisaged. Quite clearly, it simply did not know that there are no less than two of them.

For the first three days the Soviet delegation only presented to its interlocutors the program elaborated by the V.S. Pavlov government. These interlocutors were knowledgeable and influential: Michael Boskin, chairman of the president's economic council; Robert Zellik, State Department adviser on economic matters, IMF leaders, and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker.

After meeting with Baker Primakov told reporters: "We have just familiarized the secretary of state with the Soviet Government's latest plan to get out of the crisis situation.... What is it aimed at? It is above all a question of liberalization, privatization, de-statization, the freeing of prices, and a departure from the policy of the previous administrative structures."

What is the result? Were the lofty listeners attracted by the boldness and farsightedness of the new trend in the Soviet economy? Was the delegation successful in achieving the aims it had set itself in coming to the United States?

If we refrain from quoting the evasive responses of U.S. officials—responses that testify more to politeness than to a kindly attitude toward what they heard—then Washington's assessment of the Soviet Government's "anticrisis program" is simple. It amounts to this statement by one official quoted by THE WASHINGTON POST: "This (the Soviet) program is just another command economic program aimed at reforming the command economy using some private-market terminology."

"It's an anachronism," Marshall Goldman, the well-known Harvard academic, said about the Soviet Government's latest plan. "It does not envisage ruble convertibility. And Gorbachev, as recently as November, did not support private ownership.... It's too bad that the Soviet Union can't produce goods the way it produces plans."

The assessment from J. Baker himself was somewhat more affable. Not straight after the meeting but two days later—hiding behind the transparent anonymity of a "top official who talked with reporters on the secretary of state's aircraft en route to Lisbon"—he said that he

had found the Soviet Government's new, revised economic proposals mentioned by Ye. Primakov "unsatisfactory."

"On the whole, the West would like to see an economic plan which, we believe, would truly lead them to a free market," the secretary of state said. "If such a plan exists—and it seems that there is a strong desire to move forward—I would predict that many of the allies would be very, very understanding about aid that went much further than what we have talked about thus far."

Local commentators see this statement not just as a negative assessment by the United States of the specifically "anticrisis" program, but as clear approval and encouragement for what is termed the "strong desire."

The secretary of state, and later the President, clearly hinted that they envisage a range of measures being worked out by U.S. economists and the "Yavlinskiy team."

The other day the latest issue of the Washington-published journal INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS was published. It features a letter from Ye. Primakov and G. Yavlinskiy addressed to the "Group of Seven"—that is, the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, and Canada.

With the journal's permission THE NEW YORK TIMES published the letter Thursday.

Since Soviet readers are, on the whole, familiar with the main points of the letter from articles in IZVESTIYA and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, I will briefly mention that it raises the question of large-scale aid to the Soviet Union in connection with the inevitable economic and political collapse of a major world power—which would threaten mankind with very serious and unpredictable consequences.

The writers consider it urgently necessary to rapidly elaborate and implement another version of events, which here in the United States has already been dubbed the "Grand Bargain." In return for many billions of dollars in short and medium term investment, and in return for technical aid, cadre training, and know-how, we—the Soviet Union—will adopt a jointly elaborated "detailed plan of action, for which we will accept a high degree of responsibility." The implementation of the plan, as the letter writers put it, "could offer a unique opportunity for the new generation to live in an economically and politically safe world in the 21st century."

Judging by the reaction from local commentators, the main thesis of the "Grand Bargain" has been severely criticized. Observers believe that the threat of the Soviet Union's collapse—however serious its consequences, is not a sufficient incentive for the fantastic expenditure which the plan's implementation would require. That is, the incentive is, of course, strong, but it is negative and smacks of our being blackmailed into self-destruction. A positive incentive based on decisive change in the Soviet Union itself—its politics and economics—is needed. "The Russians are prepared to politely take our billions, but without servility—as befits a gentleman," one observer noted sarcastically.

On the eve of the Soviet delegation's meeting with President Bush the analysts' predictions about the outcome of the main discussion were overlaid with pessimism. "U.S. officials are highly skeptical about Soviet intentions and have warned the Soviets about the need to take more radical economic measures, irrespective of the commitments imposed by Western aid," THE WASHINGTON POST wrote.

The White House incumbent's reaction was all the more notable for clearly going beyond what had been predicted. "I was pleased with what I heard, and we will have some decisions to make.... I am more positive about a broad range of individual problems," G. Bush said after the meeting. And although he did not fail to add that "I still have some homework to do before I can make any definite comment," everyone got the impression that the tone was favorable.

It is too soon to judge with confidence the reasons behind this change in the U.S. Administration's attitude. Certain observers believe, on the basis of behind the scenes conversations, that this time the Soviet delegation did not resort to the well-known thesis of threatening our collapse and that nothing like a demand for aid was even remotely mentioned. On the other hand, the chance to demonstrate the dynamics of political and economic change in the Soviet Union was used to the full—with less pride in the "anticrisis program" and greater stress on what is being done at Harvard. "The U.S. officials said that two clearly different proposals were submitted by the Soviet side," THE NEW YORK TIMES noted. "One from Mr. Primakov and Mr. Shcherbakov, which clearly reflects Mr. Gorbachev's current economic thinking, and another—more far-reaching—proposal from Mr. Yavlinskiy. As the U.S. officials put it, this represents the position Gorbachev would be prepared to adopt if he at least sensed some support from the West."

Meanwhile, intensive work continues in Harvard on the plan which will soon be submitted for the attention of the Kremlin and White House leaders, and—if approved—subsequently to the entire "Big Seven."

Although the plan itself is not finished yet, a lot has already been said about its strategic aims. It should envisage aid which will be strictly tied in to stages of economic reform in the USSR. And, needless to say, the political changes outlined by the "Nine plus One" agreement will be implemented without any holdups and in full—from the adoption of the Union Treaty and the new constitution to direct elections for the country's president.

Drafts of the plan have attracted heightened attention from the secretary of state and the U.S. President. Not all

the country's prominent economists confirm their scientific value, just as not all politicians agree on the ways, means, and timing of aid.

However, both parties, the government, Congress, and the scientific and business worlds are agreed on the need to help the Soviet Union.

### U.S. Seen Moving Toward Accord on Credits

*PM0506145191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5*

[Report by correspondent V. Gan: "Much Depends on Us...."]

[Text] Washington, 4 Jun—U.S. President Bush has "presented to congress his recommendation to extend the powers to suspend the Jackson-Vanik amendment." This will enable the Soviet Union to continue to be "acceptable for export credit guarantee programs" of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

Thus Bush has decided to extend for another year the waiver on restrictions in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. trade which were originally linked to the infringement of Soviet citizens' rights to free exit from the USSR. As a result of the reforms the problem of emigration from the USSR has been virtually removed, as was enshrined in a recently adopted law. The White House decision, observers believe, partly helps to satisfy Moscow's request for additional credits of $1.5 billion for the purchase of agricultural produce.

As for financial and economic aid from the West as a whole, it is too soon to say. For all the positive background to the talks in Washington recently with Ye. Primakov, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's envoy, nothing concrete has been offered yet.

The West does not make loans in exchange for words alone. It needs firm guarantees—the continuation of democratic reforms, the transition to a market economy, and the switching of military production to a civilian track. In principle, one would think, that is the course that we have been trying to pursue for the past six years.

There have been reports that President Bush and his leading advisers have reached an agreement in principle regarding new credits. The final decision could come this week. Senior administration officials who wanted to remain anonymous believe that it will either be a matter of granting credits of around $1.5 billion in full or of three loans of $500 million each.

In that event each of these loans will depend on the fulfillment of conditions attaching to the whole program. The details of it are not known yet because a debate is still going on over what one government official called a "broad spectrum of political and economic factors." However that may be, consensus will be reached by all accounts after the report submitted to G. Bush by a delegation U.S. experts which has visited the USSR.

...We do not like using the word "help." And I think that there is some justification for that. In the new era of the universal recognition of the interdependence of the world, the word "cooperation" is surely more appropriate. Handouts are demeaning. But mutual—political and economic—interests are a different matter. And of course it is clear how much depends on us ourselves. No one can resolve our problems for us, nor does anyone want to.

## West Europe

### Gorbachev Visit to Norway, Sweden Previewed

*LD0406141391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] There is much interest in the Wednesday lecture Mikhail Gorbachev, as the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, is going to deliver in Oslo. Interest is also caused by the coming working meetings with the Norwegian prime minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, and the Swedish prime minister, Ingvar Carlsson, that'll take place in Stockholm, where the Soviet president will arrive on Thursday. Aleksandr Pogodin makes these comments.

Even though these will be working meetings, they will have notable significance for strengthening understanding between the Soviet Union and its northern neighbors, for developing cooperation in different areas. It is quite appropriate to say that the Soviet Union attaches notable importance to its relations with Norway, Sweden, and other Nordic countries. The expansion of cooperation with them is also an important contribution to the construction of a common European home.

Both prime ministers have visited the Soviet Union and met President Gorbachev. Their views on international problems and bilateral relations largely coincide. They are interested in expanding and improving these relations. Great possibilities open up in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres. The Soviet Union stands for radically reducing military confrontation in the region, for turning northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone, for limiting naval activities in the waters washing the region. The potential for expanding peaceful cooperation in utilizing the resources of the North and Arctic has not been used up. The Soviet Union is ready for an understanding on the development of a common energy program for northern Europe, and joint utilization of the resources of the Kola Peninsula. Questions related to the pooling of efforts in environmental protection and scientific exploration of the Arctic are quite topical. In a word, there are various and ample possibilities for mutually beneficial cooperation.

Moscow thinks highly of the positive attitude of Norway and Sweden toward the political and economic changes in the Soviet Union. Though brief, the coming meetings in Oslo and Stockholm will evidently allow Norwegian and Swedish leaders to better understand the essence of these processes and get first-hand information about matters of interest.

### Brundtland Gives Pre-Gorbachev Visit Interview

*LD0406221491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Video report by correspondent V. Lyubovtsev, including recorded interview with Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland in Oslo on 4 June; from the "Vremya" newscast—Brundtland speaks in Norwegian with superimposed translation to Russian]

[Text] Tomorrow USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev arrives in Oslo for a visit, where as winner of the Nobel Peace Prize he will give the traditional Nobel lecture. It is hard to overestimate the Soviet leader's contribution to the relaxation of international tension. Precisely to him belongs the main merit for eliminating the threat of war and creating new conditions for peaceful development throughout the world. Such is the opinion of most of the Norwegian media. [video shows street scenes; Gorbachev poster]

[Lyubovtsev] People here follow benevolently the changes in Europe, especially in the east of the continent, come out in support of the democratic transformations in our country, and welcome Gorbachev's policy and the USSR president himself, the winner of the 1990 Nobel Peace Prize. Gro Harlem Brundtlandt, Norway's prime minister, is receiving Soviet correspondents in her residence, in Government House. [video shows Lyubovtsev interviewing Brundtland]

Mrs. Prime Minister, tomorrow President Gorbachev, the head of our state, will visit Norway for the first time. What do you expect from that visit?

[Brundtland] We are very glad that we will have the opportunity to welcome the president of a great neighboring state. We welcome him both as the leader of the Soviet Union, and as the winner of the Nobel Prize for strengthening peace.

[Lyubovtsev] What will your talks with President Gorbachev be devoted to? What is the most important thing for you?

[Brundtland] The relations between our countries actually cover 1,000 years already. There has been, and is, a great deal that is positive in them, and during President Gorbachev's visit we would like to discuss problems of bilateral cooperation and the development of our ties in economics, power engineering, and environmental protection, besides exchanging views on a number of questions that still remain unresolved—for example, on the demarcation of economic zones in the Barents sea. Norway is for broad cooperation with the Soviet Union.

[Lyubovtsev] It is known that the Nobel lecture is the direct reason for President Gorbachev's visit. I would like to ask you how the awarding of that prestigious international prize to the Soviet leader was received in Norway.

[Brundtland] The decision of the Nobel committee was welcomed in our country. It is supported by most Norwegians. We think that the Soviet president deserves the prize, and that the Norwegian Nobel committee took a correct and very important decision. The fact that Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan, and that a new situation has taken shape in the countries of eastern Europe, in other regions, and in world politics as a whole—all that, I think, confirms the correctness of the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to President Gorbachev. Of course there are many complex problems in your country today. We know how hard it is to turn a large ship from one course to another. But to us, and to all who looked on the Soviet Union from the sidelines, as it were, it was obvious that perestroyka was a necessity for it, and we are at one with the Soviet people and the Soviet political leadership, which must at this difficult time chart a new course for your ship.

### Gorbachev Visits Oslo To Accept Nobel Prize

#### Makes Arrival Statement

*LD0506140391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0942 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Arrival statement by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at Oslo airport on 5 June—live]

[Text] Mrs Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman of the Nobel Committee, ladies and gentlemen. My visit to Oslo has a special reason, to express my personal gratitude to the Nobel Committee and to read the lecture as prescribed for every prize winner. Alfred Nobel set out with a famous thesis: dynamite factories will put an end to wars more quickly than speeches by diplomats in defense of peace. But, subsequently, he himself became convinced that peace and prosperity cannot be built on armaments, and in his testament he urged people to fraternity and spoke in favor of peace congresses. In our time, there are also people who are sincerely convinced that today's dynamite—nuclear weapons—are the surest means of security. But mankind has seen in time that there are means more appropriate to the goal,—trust and disarmament—which have already been begun.

A fundamental turnaround has occurred, both in international politics and in world public awareness. It would not exist if not for our perestroyka. This is the first visit by a president of the Soviet Union to our neighbor, Norway, a country about which Soviet people know a great deal, and a people which enjoy longstanding and deep respect in our country. I await my conversations with Prime Minister Gru Harlem Brundtland with

interest, with whom we are, perhaps, already well acquainted. I will be bold enough to say this. We have things to talk about, both on all-European affairs, on global problems, and bilateral ties. We shall I hope, work in such a way that Soviet-Norwegian cooperation might become better, and correspond to the principles of good-neighborliness. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the cordial welcome.

### Gorbachev, Brundtland Sign Declaration

*LD0506210991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted]

Soviet-Norweigian talks took place this afternoon. Before they began, Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland invited President Gorbachev to view Oslo from the 15th floor balcony of government house. I like your town, said Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is beautiful, very green, the lilac is blooming and the air here is good. [passage omitted]

[Video shows two delegations facing each other across a table. Gorbachev is shown flanked by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh]

In the conference hall, in a frank atmosphere of mutual understanding, the delegations of the two countries exchanged views. Both topical international issues and the problems of developing multifaceted cooperation on the basis of good-neighborliness, partnership, and mutual benefit between our states were discussed.

At the end of the talks, the leaders of the two states, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Gro Harlem Brundtland, signed a joint declaration in government house which laid down specific steps toward the development of bilateral cooperation and the strengthening of contacts between the USSR and Norway.

[passage omitted]

### Text of Joint Declaration

*LD0506222191 Moscow TASS in English 2157 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] Oslo June 6 TASS—"The Soviet Union and Norway welcome the historic changes that have taken place in Europe. These changes create possibilities for consolidating friendly relations between the states and strengthening security and stability throughout the continent of Europe," says a Soviet-Norwegian joint statement signed on Wednesday by visiting Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland.

"The parties emphasise the importance of constructing a peace order in Europe based on post-confrontational realities and on the principles that are laid down in the joint declaration signed by 22 states in Paris," the statement points out.

The Soviet Union and Norway reaffirmed the importance of cooperation between countries in the field of environmental protection.

The document also says that "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is a precondition for progress in the efforts to create a stable new order of peace for Europe. In this context the parties agree that the CSCE conference on the human dimension should continue its work after the forthcoming meeting of the conference in Moscow and become a permament elements of the CSCE process."

Touching upon security and disarmament issues, the Soviet Union and Norway emphasise that "military forces must not exceed the level that is necessary for the prevention of war and the creation of conditions for effective self-defence.

"The parties share the view that an important aim in the continuation of negotiations on conventional arms control should be to contribute towards the restructuring of military forces in a defensive direction.

"The Soviet Union and Norway underline the importance of making progress in the solution of current global issues. They agree that the United Nations must play a central role in this connection.

They welcome the positive role played by the United Nations today in the effort to strengthen international peace and security, mutual understanding, confidence and stability in the world and to increase constructive cooperation between all states.

In the field of bilateral relations, "the parties support the strengthening of political dialogue by holding regular consultations on international and bilateral issues. Special importance is being attached to contacts at the highest political level. Provision is made for meetings of the ministers of foreign affairs for regular consultations.

"The Soviet Union and Norway acknowledge the importance of achieving agreement on a delimitation line between the parties' continental shelves and economic zones in the Barents Sea area.

"A mutually acceptable delimitation line will be of great significance for the further development of neighbourly relations between the peoples of the two countries and will open the way for further cooperation in the north," the statement emphasizes.

In the field of economic cooperation, "the parties agree that there are considerable opportunities for increasing trade and developing economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation, not least in the energy sector, fisheries, science and culture.

The two countries "agree to strengthen cooperation in the fight against illegal drug trafficking and will continue work on the preparation of a bilateral agreement on this matter. The parties also agree on the importance of improving cooperation in the fight against international terrorism."

The statement says that "the Soviet Union and Norway, as neighbouring countries in the north, show great interest in developing the broadest and productive cooperation with a view to solving common tasks in various fields in this region."

## Gorbachev, Brundtland Hold News Conference

### Gorbachev's Opening Remarks

*LD0506231191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1856 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Opening statement by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev during a news conference in Oslo on 5 June—recorded]

[Text] [Gorbachev] My situation now is that the first half of my trip has ended. It has been linked with pleasant events—those connected with receiving the Nobel Peace Prize and the fact that in line with tradition, I had to deliver a lecture here in Oslo. Of course a politician's life in my view does not just consist of the red carpets that are laid before us when we walk down the aircraft steps nor the clicks of the camera shutters that can be heard now. It generally consists of difficult exhausting work and many hours of discussions either in the context of the quest for answers to the solution of internal problems, or problems which confront us all. Frequently, it means enormous lengthy conversations and time away from one's family, friends and normal social intercourse. I must say this now, because the first part of my visit here has nevertheless been the part that has been pleasant, at this news conference—and I hope that you are aware of what I said, or talked about generally in my lecture—I want again to limit myself, to limit myself to expressions of my deep gratitude to the Nobel committee for the high appraisal of my activities in the sphere of foreign policy. I interpret this mainly—I attempted to say this in my lecture—I see in this the attitude of this influential international organization to the transforming processes and democratic processes taking place within the context of implementation of the policy of perestroyka in the USSR. I think that without this, this decision would not have been taken. Furthermore, I think that even if someone at some time conceives an important thought or idea which subsequently matures over a long period, the idea can remain in the realms of wishes, thoughts and reflections, in the philosophical phrase in general, if it does not meet with reciprocal understanding and cooperation.

I must say that in connection with this I would like to testify to my deep respect for those politicians with whom I have had occasion to cooperate in recent years to open wide the door for a new phase of development in international relations and to move these international relations into the channel of healthy development. This was, all the same, a sort of happy combination, a coincidence, when urgent necessity, impulses and imperatives—which come from all sectors of our civilization, from the deep-lying strata of this civilization—were adopted by the main leading politicians of today. This opened up the possibility of getting out. I would say that this was not just getting out but bursting out to a new understanding of the world in which we live and of the need for fundamental changes in the whole intricate complex of international relations.

Therefore, I think that it would be immodest of me not to note, first the importance of that perestroyka which is being conducted by the Soviet peoples and which is of not only national but also of international importance and if I did not note the contribution and general cooperation of politicians who were able to create the new atmosphere which gives us the opportunity to say that we are witnessing deep and highly promising changes in the world. That is the first thought that I would like to express.

The second is that Mrs. Brundtland and I have said on more than one occasion—the most recent occasion was in Paris—that I should take advantage of the invitation of the country's government and carry out my own wish and that of the government of the country, the USSR, if only within the framework of a short stay, to carry out a working visit which began immediately after the various solemn parts, the solemn part connected with the presentation of the Nobel Prize.

Very sound, all-round and very effective and productive talks are behind us, which have revealed a great proximity of views and a desire to cooperate within the framework of European and world policy and within the framework of cooperation between the Nordic countries and the USSR as well as within the framework of bilateral relations.

I found it easy to talk with Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland, because we are already old acquaintances and we did not have to spend time establishing our acquaintance again. We exchange opinions on a regular basis, orally or in writing, via our diplomatic missions, and this has made our dialogue a fruitful one.

We were far from satisfied with everything when assessing the state of affairs in any particular sphere. The main thing is that we are anxious that the process of improvement in international relations should not reach the point where it is marking time and needs fresh impetus. A good basis has been formed for this. We thought about the mechanisms that would help us to make cooperation between the USSR and northern countries, countries neighboring the USSR, more effective, and it looks as if a few things are taking shape.

We devoted a lot of attention to the European process, various problems connected with the European process,

and the context in which we considered things was this: Yes, we have passed through a certain initial stage, a very important and significant one, which has changed the situation radically and brought us to a completely new stage in the development of the whole situation in Europe. I am talking primarily about the united Germany resulting from these changes. I am also talking about the changes that have taken place in Eastern Europe, and of course I am talking about perestroyka in the USSR, but I am also talking about the changing views and policies of the Western countries and about the important, constructive, and encouraging things happening there.

So the processes that have developed are wide-ranging and deep. They demand very intensive intellectual work. Now we should do this work all together, carry it out, so as not to lose what we have achieved. At the same time it should be said that despite all the positive achievements there are a lot of new problems that are being posed in a new way. We should understand how security can be built, how economic, scientific-technical and cultural cooperation can be built, on which institutions it should lean and what the fate of old institutions is to be—all these issues were discussed in friendly terms, frankly, and basically in an atmosphere of trust. I am very satisfied with the conversation and hope that our dialogue will continue and we should specifically think... [changes thought] tomorrow foreign ministers as well as ministers connected with the economy will continue the discussion we have started regarding bilateral relations to give concrete expression to the conversation that took place at our meeting. I hope that although it was a short visit it will give us both satisfaction.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Norway in the person of the Norwegian prime minister, and looking back to the distant past, to express sincere gratitude to all those citizens of Norway and to the government for the memory they keep of our joint struggle during the hard trying years of fighting fascism. Our people do come here, our seamen are frequent guests here, just as Norwegians are in our country. This is what constitutes the best part of our history, what our people hold dear. I am grateful for this memory, it is especially important for me to say this on the eve of the day when fascist Germany started the war against the USSR—we are only a few days from that date. I would also like to thank the people of Norway for the feelings of solidarity with perestroyka, for the humane feelings of compassion expressed by them in connection with the tragedy in Armenia, in connection with the tragedy at the Chernobyl atomic station. We know that all Norway responded to this misfortune with their hearts and souls. I cannot help but remember here that these actions were carried out under the patronage of his majesty and the government of Norway, and that the people have done a great deal. Our people value this highly.

## Says World 'Needs' Perestroyka

*LD0606093491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1856 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[News conference by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland in Oslo on 5 June; Brundtland's remarks in Norwegian with superimposed Russian translation;—recorded]

[Text] [Unidentified Norwegian television correspondent] A question for President Gorbachev about bilateral relations. We have been talking about demarcation in the Barents Sea for almost 20 years. In connection with the Nine plus One agreement, this question occurs to me: Should the future resolution of this issue be based on a consensus between the Soviet and Russian leaderships before this issue is resolved? After all, Russia will now have more, significant control of its own resources.

[Gorbachev] You already know everything, don't you? [laughter] Good. Yes. Incidentally, yesterday I sent the draft of the Union treaty which was given its final touches at the last discussion at Novo-Ogarevo for conclusive agreement on it, so we really are close to resolving all issues, including those which pertain to the delimitation of areas of competence.

So, as to your question: We spoke of this, and this is an issue which we placed first. But, first and foremost, we must say that although this question has been discussed for 20 years, nevertheless much has been done over the last few years, and three-quarters of the problems have already been removed or resolved. The remaining part is the subject of active talks, and I think that we will settle this problem using the approaches which have already worked, taking into account mutual interests.

Moreover, together with Madam Prime Minister, today we have provisionally spoken of the fact that we need to think of possible agreements for cooperation in this area and for joint exploitation of all this. We have agreed to hold consultations on this matter.

As regards the issue of whether it will be a hindrance that these accords have been reached and new relations and new areas of competence have been designated and the division of authority has been made between the Union, Union bodies, and the republics and as to whether this will cast doubts over all the work which has been done: No, including... [changes thought] ...and in the first place because this Union treaty emphasizes the fact that the Union of Sovereign Soviet Republics is a democratic, federative-democratic state and is the legal successor to the Union of Soviet Republics, including the fact that it is a subject of international law, and the legal successor of the USSR. This is the first point.

Second, both in current conditions, and even more so in future ones, these are of course issues which have nevertheless never been resolved without the republic when they have affected the interests of one republic or

another. Whether this was within the framework of another democratic process or within the framework of another sort of glasnost—or even in the absence of glasnost is another matter—but nevertheless, it was also present then. This will now be resoved within the framework of the new treaty, and I am sure that no problems exist here and there is no need for apprehension.

[Viktor Lubovtsev, Soviet television] Soviet television. Mikhail Sergeyevich, today in your Nobel lecture the necessity of closer economic cooperation and even, as you put it, the synchronization of activities between the USSR and the large Western countries, in particular the G-7 countries, was especially stressed. What are the real chances that these countries will give assistance to our reforms, and to what extent do you think their leaders share your conviction that these countries need perestroyka just as much as Soviet Union does?

[Gorbachev] Well, I think it is no longer news to you that we need perestroyka first, but that the world also needs it just as much, because I think everybody understood this long ago and I have spoken of this several times. Perestroyka is a deep process, however; it is the turn to the new ways of living. This is in essence a very complicated transition connected with getting out of one way, one system, and entering another. Every society faces its greatest difficulties and dangers during this transitional stage especially when you consider what sort of society this is. This is an enormous society, a unique world of coexisting peoples; a society with 1,000 years of long history behind it; a society which speaks 120 languages or more—it keeps adding up, the data enable us to say otherwise—a society with global responsibility, overloaded with problems. This shows clearly how complicated this transition toward the new ways of life is.

Now I am talking about the phase when we have reached some sort of a turning point in this transitionary stage, this transitionary period. I do not think that this is the first or the last turning point; there will surely be more. Still, one can talk today about the critical stage in the development of perestroyka because we are actually entering the mixed economy, coming toward it; we have really found ourselves already in a pluralistic society. This is being demonstrated in increasingly varied forms. We are really reforming our national state. In other words, now we are dealing with the most fundamental questions.

It is very important to keep all this within the course of the peaceful changes and avoid confrontation, especially the wide civilian conflicts, with fewer losses for ourselves. If we are to recognize the international aspects and significance of perestroyka, then the world too should be going through this critical stage.
at we are resolving conflict situations and old problems on the basis of cooperation in one region of the world or another. Cooperatively, we sought out all the resources and opportunities to begin political accord before adopting important decisions, including various important ones in order to resolve the problem which arose in the Persian Gulf. We are able to do all of this thanks to what has been created and has arisen as a result of perestroyka.

So, if we find the strength and opportunities to unite efforts, to unite everything, to resolve problems, then at this critical stage of the development of perestroyka we should understand that in this case, too, cooperation should take on new forms. In connection with this I said that it was of a particular sort since I cannot speak about synchronization. In our own country we are even unable to raise the question of synchronization within the framework of the union. But I said of a particular sort in order to say that in these months much will be decided. And if this is so then I think that we are right to bring these considerations to the attention of all of our partners with whom we have been cooperating over all these years on all major political questions and to express our thoughts about new forms of cooperation.

There are, you know, key questions which must simply be resolved. I think that today, if you noticed, I once again repeated what I have said before. We need three integral component elements to ensure that the process of perestroyka is successful. These are, first, social accord. Probably the people who are here from the USSR—and I see your colleagues the foreign correspondents of the Moscow newspapers right in front of me, they are also here and when I look over here I see some more—they know that in society now, in spite of all the apparently difficult and super-heated nature of the atmosphere, the tendency toward accord is clearly coming to the fore just as if safety mechanisms in society are coming into play. In spite of everything this tendency is coming to the fore and will gather strength indeed in the face of the important things, of the important tasks. We must achieve social accord. That is the first thing.

We must get through the transitional period more quickly. That means we must move ahead with reforms more quickly. That is the second thing. We must radicalize reforms, move them ahead more quickly. And in connection with this we must now intensively take those decisions that are necessary to us to insure that the process speeds up.

And the third thing is that we are really in need of specific displays of solidarity in order to unite efforts and, on the basis of cooperation, more painlessly or less painfully pass through the moments connected with the convertibility of the ruble, with the modernization of the sectors working for the market, with the modernization of sectors which are in the interest of the whole of Europe and ourselves. All of this requires that we should now give thought to how best to cooperate.

This is, I think, a compressed version of what I should like to say to the colleagues with whom I cooperate fruitfully and who intend to meet in July. And the thought came to me, why should we not have a talk? And I think that I have other things to say on this theme, too. And not just on this question, but what I said about

where we have got to as a result of the fact that we have passed through the first stage of departing from the cold war. I think that this, too, could be a subject for discussion at this meeting.

Therefore, I place my hopes in the wisdom and farsightedness of those politicians who now head the states which are members of the Seven. I think that we should see the whole situation today, think about the near future; but if we lose sight of the long-term guidelines then we could end up in a difficult situation. So that is my proposal for such a discussion. I do not know to what extent this is possible, but I have tried to disclose a little of the formula which I laid out. Madam prime minister and I have spoken. I have met with a very attentive listener, but not only a listener.

[Norwegian correspondent, in Norwegian followed by Russian translation] The next question from the press comes from AFTENPOSTEN. Madam prime minister, could we hear about the conclusion of your talks regarding the line in the Barents Sea, and what was Norway's answer to [words indistinct]?

[Brundtland] This was a central topic in our talks, because the settlement of this problem will also be of significance for other issues concerning bilateral cooperation. I am stating this, but I should like to draw your attention to page five of the declaration, where both sides confirm the importance of interaction and the development of the continental shelf. This is very important for our future cooperation. These are issues on which we essentially agreed to continue holding consultations and discussions. Our contacts have already produced positive results. The problems are complex. It is hard to define them. Nonetheless, we have already got through, in principle, three quarters of the disputed territorial issues. Significant success has been achieved, at least since 1986, when I first met Gorbachev in Moscow, and we shall tackle this problem through further cooperation. I should like to say that it is very important to clarify this and to find solutions to problems in economic cooperation together.

We also have certain positive results as a result of our contacts; they have also come about thanks to perestroyka in the Soviet Union. The process which has begun is important, not only for our two countries, but for the whole world as well. We will continue to seek models that will ensure security and cooperation, in order to establish a basis for interaction between our economies and the convertibility of currencies. Each problem has its own importance, and its solution will make a contribution to the settlement of all problems. This will be important for all of us in various matters, whether they concern the economy or environmental protection. Millions of people in our country and yours are physically able to make some kind of contribution, but they will give moral support [as heard]. However, this applies primarily to the leadership of the Soviet Union. We have to find points of contact in economic cooperation, within some kind of reliable framework. We discussed this; this is our stance, and we discussed it.

[LA STAMPA correspondent] This is a question to Mikhail Sergeyevich. This is the LA STAMPA newspaper, an Italian newspaper. It seems to me that this morning you spoke more like a person than the leader of a large state. This is natural. Therefore, I address you more as a person than as a leader who cannot help, I believe, but suffer as a result of the current contradictions. The whole world acknowledges your service in the matter of improving international relations. But in your country, many do not acknowledge this. Not only this, but they do they not understand your philosophy for a transition to a new society. How do you evaluate this? How do you endure this?

[Gorbachev] I endure it as a person, and I evaluate it as a politician. [laughter] Generally speaking, I could limit myself to this, but I will say a few words.

I think that—and I have tried to say this—from the condition and the society out of which we are emerging, taking into account the volume of changes which we have come up with, the transition goes very deep. This is not cosmetic, these are not running repairs. This is a transformation at the level of the system, at the level of the base. If the point is that property relations are being reformed, if the point is that profound political reform is taking place, if the point is that the federation is being reformed, then it is understandable which interests, which deep-rooted interests are affected. This all sets enormous forces in motion. As there are interests and they are affected, and moreover, fundamentally the process of discussion and consultation is arising in society, and all of this is natural.

I could now give a quick overview of the history of perestroyka, but I do not want to do this now, I just want to give one illustration. We thought that we would go, and firstly, we would resolve one thing, then another one, then we would start working consistently in the way in which we are accustomed to build models and then implement them, or actively introduce them as we said. So, naturally, the first thing which demanded attention was reform of the economy. For those at the top in the Soviet Union, particularly, already knew a time when difficult economic processes were going on in the Soviet economy. We already knew a time when the growth rate was zero, and when there was a fall in the national income, and only to a certain extent did it manage to remain at zero, or did it rise to one percent because of the profitability of foreign trade, particularly the profitability of the oil market.

But the domestic national product was already falling. Naturally, something should have been done, first and foremost, about the economy. This is clear. This affects the social life of the people, and via the people, it affects politics in the larger sense. We occupied ourselves with this, and as you will recall, there was the idea of

acceleration based on the modernization of machine-building, and the idea was correct. Moreover, it was overdue. We should have done what all developed countries did in the 1970's. We should have done it. But what did we come up against?

For two years we were looking for capital investments, we were making decisions, we were using these mechanisms, these tough pressures so that this process would get going. But it didn't. After all it requires something entirely different in attitude, different thinking. The economy must be different. It must look for these discoveries, hunt for them. But in our country science and engineering solutions were rejected. Everything went into storage, onto the scrap heap. What the entire world economy was hunting for, in our country this was lying around for years.

Why? Because it was an expenditure type of economy, people's interests were not activated. Modernization—this is all connected—after all this means emotions, this means commitments, this means searching. No, cadres left and the people were to a certain extent already conditioned by history itself. Then questions cropped up, the question of political reform, that if we did not change this system of management, it would just hold all spheres in its grip and the process would not get off the ground. A party conference was held then. Questions of political reform were discussed. And after this very powerful forces, so to speak, were activated. Through the forms of democracy and glasnost the people itself began to enter into this process. All this is being accompanied by searches and painful debates; people get agitated and emotional. One can understand this. We are leaving one thing, but is it clear where we will arrive? Will this be better or not?

Our people have been brought up in such a way that it can stand up to a very... to the biggest loads—it can stand up to it—but they want to know and are constantly asking the question: We will stand up to it, but how much does this amount to? But will things not get even worse? Will we not make a immense strategic miscalculation?

That is why a discussion was required. Naturally, some recognize it, others are careful, yet others reserve their opinion: let's wait and see. That is after all how this process is proceeding. But today, I think, society has matured, it has realized the need for all these changes: democracy, glasnost, reforming ownership relations so as to open up the possibility for a person to feel himself to be the proprietor and to be able to realize his interest as a personality. The very same thing applies to political processes, too. The very same thing applies to reforming the state. Even though here masses of people at the same time voice concern and demand a balanced approach from politicians.

So, this optimum must be found so as not to get embroiled in adventurism and at the same time to advance the process of perestroyka. Now this needs to be done more decisively because a great many things have become clear and, most importantly, people have already to a considerably extent matured (?for this). This is the way. So I don't really mind, I endure it as a man, but as a politician all this is clear to me. Such a transition cannot go through in such a way...only in the Lithuanian parliament is everything clear. They assembled for half an hour, raised their hands: we have voted independence. This is despite the fact that for 50 years, despite the fact that the Constitution exists—both of the Union and of the republic, which recognizes a certain status of this republic, despite the fact that immense changes have taken place in the demography and the settling of peoples, in the organization of defense, in the stationing of armed forces, in the construction of lines of communication which serve the country as a power: I am referring to shipping routes etc.

Such things happen. This is how it is in our country. This is how things are in our country. This you can now observe in our country, but you are not there all the time. You sometimes leave. This, comrade Chiosa or Mr. Chiosa—I don't know what to call you.

[Unidentified voice] You have replied in full.

[Gorbachev] So then it was all right this way.

So, there is nothing particularly unexpected going on, although everything is proceeding both very painfully and with difficulty. But I am already repeating myself here. We have to move forward.

[PRAVDA correspondent] The newspaper PRAVDA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, I want to ask you this question. More precisely, I have two questions. Firstly, among the theoretical novelties in your lecture there was a very interesting point regarding the balance of interests, so to speak. Evidently, this is a thought, as we understand it and I have heard many commentaries, to the effect that we must first cooperate and then replace the balance of forces as a principle on the international arena. So, could you develop this thought a little more specifically. Secondly, since people are already asking you personal questions, I would like to know: if you were now to nominate a candidate for this year's Nobel Prize, which of your colleagues on the international arena would you back?

[Gorbachev] Well, as for the first question. All in all, the new political thinking, since it has taken shape as such is, nonetheless, based on two things. Namely, recognition of every people's right to freedom of choice and the balance of interests.

I think that we have found ourselves today at a stage of development of our civilization in which we cannot, all in all, disregard the interests of any people or any state. Attempts to behave otherwise will be a burden—the situation today is different. Yes, we have our interests, the United States of America has its interests, but then every state has them. You cannot get away from this. Ways to combine these interests have to be sought:

through the economy, through trade, through cultural exchanges, through setting up [unspecified], through political dialogue, in order to harmonize, to harmonize these interests through cooperation. I think that up until now this has still not been prevalent in international relations, and relapses are making themselves felt, coercive pressure is making itself felt.

But you are right. If we are talking about the balance of interests as a method of solving problems—and this means negotiations, seeking compromises, and finding solutions, and so on—to seek this very same balance is a difficult matter, and this balance will always be changing. But unless we take this path, we will nearly always come up against attempts to return again to the policy of strength. And then we will overturn everything connected with the new thinking, with the new phase of development in international relations. But this, this would mean to fight against needs that have objectively come to the fore and that dictate this as an imperative, as a method of solving problems. Because it was the policy of strength which drew us into the arms race, it set peoples against one another, sowed emnity in continents, caused thousands of conflicts in which opposing sides clashed, and the people or small countries concerned found themselves used as small change in these regional conflicts. And so on and so forth.

This is a dead-end policy. So we need to move away from the policy of strength and move toward a policy that takes into account the interests of all peoples, and which will have at its basis the balance of interests.

[PRAVDA correspondent] Whom would you nominate for the Nobel Prize?

[Gorbachev] I will think about it and give you an answer later in Moscow. [Laughter]

[Moderator] The last question now, we still have a big program ahead of us today.

[Norwegian television correspondent; questions only partly translated into Russian] I represent a private television company. Two questions from Telenorvege. How do you assess the actions of the military in Lithuania on Monday evening?

[Gorbachev, turning to Brundtland] Are they in a hurry to send you to the United Nations? In general, we have nothing against it, but let the Norwegians think about it.

I have already heard so much today, I was getting off the aircraft, and your colleague from Norwegian Television, who is very active in Moscow, too, and always tries to ask me the first question, and manages it, too—I had only just left the aircraft, and he asked me this question. First and foremost, I must say that the process is a very difficult one in our country, you know. In the sphere of interethnic relations and perestroyka, the renewal of the Federation, unforeseen difficulties have arisen. We probably did not expect anything like this, but nevertheless, as a result of the approaches after October, a great deal was done to ensure that these peoples, who traditionally lived on this land could realize their potential as nations, and as regards state autonomous formations, language, culture and so on. A great deal was done. However, there was much that piled up, too, precisely with regard both to language and culture, and with regard to unjust decisions in respect of entire peoples, and the repressions that took place. Of course, in the conditions of the democratic process and glasnost, this all became the subject of discussion. Issues connected with the history of the formation of our state surfaced.

You know, this is a major and very complex question, and I always call on everyone in the Soviet Union to be very attentive and very careful and very balanced, because there is no more delicate subject than interethnic relations.

Here it is possible to achieve either hugh success and a breakthrough, if trust and concord arise, or, on the contrary, it is possible to bury the whole of perestroyka if a decision is not found that can satisfy, on the basis of achieving concord of such interests—Comrade Kolesnichenko in this instance—the balance of the interests of all the peoples living in this country. And many conflicts arise, have already arisen that have drawn us into a very difficult situation. They have caused huge worries and also casualties, a firing of passions. I must say that everything interlinks here. Many have jumped up at this point and are trying to realize their own goals, the separatist elements. But as a whole, nevertheless, a healthy process is going on of revival of the peoples, their languages, culture, independence, and finding new forms of life in this multinational state. The main thing was that it was necessary to reveal what their opinion was, because there is an awful lot of speculation. When speaking about this issue or throwing light on other topics, all cite the point of view of the people, claiming that they are expressing the point of view of the people.

At that time I, in a most difficult situation—you remember when, at the beginning of December, I think, or even at the end of December going over into January, the congress was going on—I nevertheless once again plucked up my courage and introduced the question of the referendum. Well it was a question of principle, it was necessary to determine our position in a referendum. So nine republics which contain 90, 92, 93 potential territories, populations [as heard] held the referendum. Eighty percent took part in the referendum despite all the calls from those who were against the referendum and who in general are in favor of the collapse of the Union, and 76 percent of them voted for the preservation of the Union, but of a renewed Union.

These processes are going on. And even after the referendum the search for those new forms toward which the renewed federation must come, how responsibility, rights and responsibility, are to be allocated between union organs and the republics—all this is ongoing. And it is going on with much complexity. But, nevertheless, it is being accomplished. But a number of republics must

still hold their referendums and determine how they will resolve this. Others, in my opinion, are avoiding this. What I am in favor of, what society, I think, is now in favor of is everything being decided constitutionally.

We are again writing into the treaty that for those union republics which do not sign the renewed union treaty, relations with them will be decided on the basis of those constitutional norms which exist. And we have them: The right to secede is provided for, as is the implementation of the right of a people to self- determination through secession. But there is a law on secession.

Well, it is necessary to go through the whole of this process. But on the way, one must not permit the situation to be exacerbated, peoples to be set against each other, relations to be allowed [changes thought] to make decisions that place people in unequal relationships.

Look what is happening in Georgia. Look what is happening in the Baltic republics. These are those very same democrats who are shouting from the rooftops that they are in favor of perestroyka, that they support it. But they are making decisions which deprive people of legitimate rights instead of making use of this, of constitutional forms, and instead of resolving the tasks. Once they disregard this, situations arise in which are accompanied by very unpleasant phenomena, painful phenomena. And this affects everyone. After all, you and I react when somehow or other the military or the militia turn out to have been drawn into some situation or other. And look what is happening every day, when people abandon everything and leave. And there are thousands, hundreds of thousands of refugees in the Soviet Union because there are already unbearable conditions for their life in individual regions.

All this needs to be seen. There cannot be two standards. I will never agree to the fact that the moment some tension arises in the Baltic republics, the entire Western press kicks up a fuss and shouts: Help, they want to stage a coup again; the empire is strangling, etc. And what is taking place in other places and what is happening to the Russians, to the Poles, to the Ukrainians in the Baltic republics? That is something the press keeps silent about. What kind of standards are these? First and second grade?

No, if we go that way there will not be any democracy nor any tranquillity in any society, in any society. This we know. We know this from Western Europe where Turks and Yugoslavs etc, went to work and what this was accompanied by when they were placed in an unequal situation. This will spring up in any country if this arises. If we say we are defending the rights of the person, we signed the charter, we gave an oath, as they say—all of us, Europeans, with the participation of the Americans and the Canadians, made a vow: Let's fight for this. And I ask you to adopt an understanding attitude to what is happening in our country. It is very complicated. We would like to resolve everything peacefully, after all, in constitutional forms. And what is taking place there? Try to get to the bottom of it.

There was a phone call from the IZVESTIYA newspaper, so I read, to [Defense] Minister Yazov: Why is it that patrols have appeared in Vilnius? It turns out that they were tackling their garrison tasks there. At once this was again presented as though a military coup had almost taken place, again the lawful authorities would be eliminated. This was broadcast to the whole of Lithuania, to the entire republic. And in the course of 24 hours the information changes. When they rang Yazov to ask him what he could say and to comment, he said: You ring yes, an IZVESTIYA correspondent in Lithuania and ask what is happening there. That is to say, such things happen, you know such local things arise which frequently no one is able to explain. But in this case nothing dramatic took place.

The dramatic thing was when Latvia or Lithuania established a custom-house on the border with Belorussia. It had separated itself off, but meanwhile no one has abolished the Constitution and it is known where custom-houses exist in our country. And as long as the issue has not been resolved how can custom-houses be discussed? A situation, clashes, a conflict arose at once: The death of a person from one side, the reaction then from the other. And this took off, it snowballed. I do not think that someone organized anything. But perhaps someone wanted, as it were, to play this trick, bearing in mind that Gorbachev is travelling to the Nordic countries. Well, now the procuracy is looking into this, what was the matter after all? This and the other case—what were the roots of this? Well, now, aren't you getting tired of us.

[Moderator] Thank you. I thank you all for your attention, and I thank Madam Brundtland and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for taking part in the news conference. All the best.

## Visit Reviewed; Bessmernykh Cited

*OW0606072391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[By Petr Vassiliev, diplomatic correspondent; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has begun his visit to two Scandinavian countries. After he arrived in the Norwegian capital Oslo at noon local time on Wednesday, he made a speech in the Nobel Committee expressing gratitude for the Peace Prize he had earlier received.

Later in the day Mr. Gorbachev met with the Norwegian Premier Gro Harlem Brundtland and then took part in a joint news conference.

In the evening the Soviet leader is scheduled to be received by King Harald V and Queen Sonia of Norway, who will give a dinner in his honor.

On Thursday Mr. Gorbachev will pay a one day visit to Sweden for talks with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson and other Swedish officials. Before returning to Moscow in the evening, he will meet with Brazil's President Fernando Collor de Mello in the Soviet residence in Stockholm.

In his Nobel speech the Soviet President reaffirmed his commitment to humanitarian values, further pro-democracy reforms in the Soviet Union, and new political thinking. He spelt out his concept of building a new world order and his stand on the present state of international affairs.

Mr. Gorbachev went into detail about the situation inside the USSR and comprehensively described the disposition of political forces in the country.

Part of his Nobel speech dealt with the Soviet Union's relationships with the Great Seven and the prospects for integrating the Soviet economy into the world economic system. The Soviet leader suggested a number of specific measures to that effect and outlined a program for possible cooperation during the next few years.

According to Mr. Vladimir Tumarkin of the presidential press service, President Gorbachev thereby "recognized the civilized rules of the game played in the world market—a 'must' for the USSR to be admitted to international economic organizations."

USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, asked by IF [INTERFAX] to comment on the content and goals of Gorbachev's talks in Norway and Sweden, said those were "real summit talks covering all the aspects of bilateral relations." According to Mr. Bessmertnykh, special attention would be given to the Baltic situation, which would make it possible not only to discuss ways of turning the Baltic Sea into a nuclear free zone, but also to study the entire package of European problems at close quarters.

The Foreign Minister observed that "the European processes have not been as smooth as initially expected. There have been certain conceptual differences." The implication is that "some groups in the West would like European development to be based on old structures. The Soviet Union, in recognizing the expediency of adhering to such structures for some limited period of time, still insists that stability must in the final analysis be based on all- European processes which must play a leading, not auxiliary, role."

The Soviet minister protested against attempts to "hang the European process onto NATO as an appendix." There are many problems to think over and discuss, he concluded.

## King Harold Hosts Dinner for Gorbachev

### Dinner Speeches Exchanged

*LD0606061691 Moscow TASS in English 0556 GMT 6 Jun 91*

[Text] Oslo June 6 TASS—A dinner on behalf of the Norwegian King and Queen in honour of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife, who are on a visit in the Norwegian capital, was given here on Wednesday evening. The heads of the two states exchanged speeches at the dinner.

Addressing the Soviet guest, King Harold V noted that the demarcation lines in post-war Europe are being erased, and confrontation and conflict are forced to yield the way to cooperation and talks.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the charter for a new Europe signed in Paris in November 1990 create the basis for a new permanent peace order in Europe. The Norwegian monarch stressed the important contribution by the Soviet leader to this progress.

He expressed hope that perestroika of Soviet society towards democracy, freedom and human rights will be a success. "This, above all, conforms to the interests of the Soviet Union, but this is also in our interests and the interests of the entire world community," the king noted.

In his reply speech, Gorbachev said that the essence of Soviet perestroika is to reform and revive the great state and to return it to the bosom of world civilisation on new principles.

The most difficult thing in this process is not the economy, but psychology, the destruction of distorted ideas, customs, attitude to work, law, norms of life and, last but not least, to the outside world.

In the past few weeks, there is some calm in society and signs of concord in the political life, which will enable the country to overcome the crisis, to march more confidently along the road of reforms and to create a new union, the president continued.

Turning to the talks held in Oslo, Gorbachev described them as "very frank, substantive and successful". In the opinion of the Soviet president, Soviet-Norwegian relations have a good future.

As the USSR overcomes the period of crisis in its development, these relations "will pick up dynamism and scale".

"Expanding cooperation between the USSR and Norway on new principles in resolving political and economic problems in northern Europe, in developing and protecting the Arctic's ecology, we, I hope, will increase the joint and original contribution to the European great cause," Gorbachev concluded.

### Norweigan Photo Exhibit Honors Gorbachev

*LD0306151191 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 3 Jun 91*

[By special correspondents Nikolay Vukolov, Sergey Neshumov and Aleksandr Surikov]

[Text] Oslo June 3 TASS—The photo exhibition "Mikhail Gorbachev: Time of Changes" opened at the Oslo townhall today. The exposition, sponsored by city authorities, the Norway-Soviet Union Society and the NOVOSTI News Agency, includes photographs describing state activities by the Soviet president and urgent problems at the present stage of perestroyka.

The photo display was timed to coincide with the forthcoming visit by the Soviet leader to Norway. On June 5, he will deliver a lecture in Oslo usually read by Nobel Prize winners. The 1990 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to Gorbachev.

This prestigeous international prize was awarded to him for his outstanding role in the peace process and an impressive contribution to detente in the world. According to the tradition, prizes are awarded on December 10, the day of Alfred Nobel's death.

However, the extremely packed work programme prevented the Soviet president from coming to Oslo at that time. Therefore, it was decided to postpone the Nobel lecture until this June.

This is a very expressive and interesting exhibition, Oslo Vice Mayor Ragnhild Skjibsted told TASS. It graphically shows how the Soviet Union lives today. Norwegians are closely following changes in the neighbouring country.

"We are waiting with interest for Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival. His visit will undoubtedly be a very important event. I'm sure the visit will promote the development of Norwegian-Soviet relations in various spheres," he noted.

### Shevardnadze Interviewed on New Book

*PM0606095191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 91 p 3*

[Interview with E.A. Shevardnadze, former USSR foreign minister, in Paris by N. Dolgopolov—date not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "French Will Be First Readers"]

[Text] Paris—Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze has come to France for the first time since ceasing to be a top Soviet leader. All the more pleasant then that he is received as cheerfully as before, and perhaps even with greater sincerity. It is surmised that Shevardnadze will be received by President Francois Mitterrand, Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, and other pillars of the upper French political hierarchy. The present purpose of the visit is the launch of Shevardnadze's book "The Future Belongs to Freedom [Budushcheye prinadlezhit svobode]." The French publishing house "Odile Jacob" is the first to publish the book in the West. At the end of June or the beginning of July we too will read the book, in Russian.

[Dolgopolov] Why did you decide to write this book?

[Shevardnadze] It is a book about my country in which events are in turmoil—events not only of national, but also of world significance. I wanted to show how we moved toward this great revolution, how we came to the conclusion that everything in our country was rotten and needed changing. After all, we all grew up in the conditions of a totalitarian regime which shaped our consciousness. And the process of transformation is long and incredibly difficult. People should respect our country. But under no circumstances should they fear it. Here we have made some headway. This is what the book is about.

[Dolgopolov] Are you au courant with what happened the other day in Lithuania?

[Shevardnadze] I don't know the details, you understand. But I am against If the military interference continues, we will lose everything that has been gained through perestroyka.

[Dolgopolov] The "G-7" is debating whether to invite Gorbachev to the London meeting...

[Shevardnadze)...They definitely should. Irrespective of whether it is Gorbachev or another president of the great Soviet Union. I am grateful to Francois Mitterrand. He has come out in favor...

[Dolgopolov] And should we also be helping the Gorbachev regime?

[Shevardnadze] I would not like the profound processes taking place in the USSR to be associated in the West with just one man, even if that man is Gorbachev. It will still prove impossible to isolate the Soviet Union—it is such a great power. And the West's attempts to bring about this isolation are very dangerous. In conditions of isolation those people who still dream of Soviet dictatorship acquire new and additional chances.

[Dolgopolov] Do you maintain contact with Gorbachev?

[Shevardnadze] We keep in touch. Meetings, telephone conversations. I will say that I consider myself his friend. Although this does not deprive me of the right to tell Gorbachev when I disagree with him.

(Dolgopolov] Will the probable election of Yeltsin as Russian president lead to the devaluation of the power of the USSR president?

[Shevardnadze] I don't think so. The Union president and the republic presidents have to get the country out of the state of crisis. And at the moment we are on the verge of real chaos and anarchy. We must not get distracted by trifles—we have to avoid catastrophe.

[Dolgopolov] Tell me frankly: Do you regret your resignation?

[Shevardnadze] No, I do not regret it. I took the right step, the correct step.

## Supreme Soviet

### Supreme Soviet Debates Privatization Bill

*OW0506152591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] The Supreme Soviet has begun to discuss the amended version of the draft bill on privatization which provides for the possibility of denationalizing all state run facilities, apart from those belonging to the defense industry and bearing on environmental protection and human health.

Under the draft state-owned property will largely be sold. Labor staffs will be given priority in the process of denationalization. Facilities can be bought either by their staff or leasers. They can be turned into joint-stock companies or sold by auction or by contest. Both Soviet and foreign juridicial persons and citizens will be in a position to act as buyers.

Payment can be made by installment within 10 years.

The draft was worked out by the government. It also provides for gratuitous transfer of basic assets worn out by at least 70 percent.

The most heated debates developed in connection with the stand taken by deputy prime minister Vladimir Scherbakov who resolutely opposed the gratuitous transfer of industrial facilities to their labor staff. According to him, even if only 35 percent of the government property is subject to gratuitous privitization, this would double the rate of inflation in the country.

Besides, Vladimir Scherbakov stressed that the denationalization program should be accompanied by endeavors to resolve the problem of employment. According to him, the cabinet ministers intend to submit to the parliament a draft bill on bankruptcy which provides for measures designed to ensure social security for workers.

Under the draft bill facilities run by the central authorities will be privatized by the State Property Fund, and those run by the republican authorities by the relevant republican organizations.

Apart from the State Property Fund labor collectives will also enjoy initiative as regards the privatization of state-owned facilities.

### Debate Postponed For Improvements

*LD0506155791 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The Soviet Parliament today postponed the debate on the new privatisation bill for two weeks so that it could be improved.

The bill gives constituent republics broad powers in deciding on forms and time of privatisation and gives work collectives priority in acquiring shares issued by their enterprises.

After workers repay 20 per cent of the venture's value ownership rights for the enterprise are passed to the work collective. Privatisation will be monitored by the Soviet State Property Fund.

Under the bill some privatised property will be handed over to individuals free of charge. However, First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov said the government supports buy-outs rather than hand-outs.

He opposed giving out certificates that could be used to buy shares free of charge. In contrast, the Russian Government suggests giving each citizen a payments cheque for 7,000 roubles—a total of 1.2 trillion roubles. Russian authorities believe this would put all Russian citizens in equal conditions.

This would increase inflation because the market will be inundated by huge amounts of new payments means, Shcherbakov said.

In addition, many people would try to sell their certificates, instead of buying shares for them. As a result, "shadow economy dealers" would be able to buy many enterprises.

"Free-of-charge" privatisation is applicable only to antiquated production capacities and social and cultural services, Shcherbakov said.

However, most lawmakers said that about 30 per cent of industrial assets should be handed over to the public for free.

"We should remember that we are passing the bill in a poverty-ridden country and it is necessary to grant immense benefits to the people so that privatisation does not halt at the very beginning," Deputy Aleksandr Kuzmin of Moscow said.

### Deputy Prime Minister Comments

*LD0506103791*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2105 GMT on 4 June, during its "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on 4 June proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet, carries a 12-minute report on the draft law on "destatification and privatization" including recorded remarks by USSR First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov. The program announcer reports:

"The floor was given to Vladimir Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR: His speech clearly expressed the idea that it is necessary to take into account the changing situation in relations between the center and republics. It seems to us, he said, that the proportion of Union and republican jurisdiction in this sphere has changed so much that it would be more

correct to turn this law into the basis of legislation of the Union and of the republics on destatification and privatization, as many republics are insisting.

"The central thing, the deputy head of the government believes, is the question of how to correlate what is to be paid for and what is to be free when destatification is being carried out. He said the government is in favor of the process of privatization being for the most part a sell-off [vozmezdno]. According to him, to give the people certificates, coupons, or any other new sort of warrant for payment will lead to a new burst of inflation.

"In Shcherbakov's opinion, it is impossible to determine criteria for free allocation of state property that suit everyone. Whatever criterion you choose—by age, industry, republic—someone will always feel wronged. So privatization without payment is only possible in a few sectors, for example in the social and cultural sphere, the deputy prime minister stressed."

Vladimir Shcherbakov answered questions from deputies about how ordinary workers can afford to buy shares, saying that there is no fair way to allocate them; and about the social sphere, about which he said:

[Begin Shcherbakov recording] "Calculations as to the social and economic consequences of the adoption of this law have been made; we presented them in the first reading and then presented them additionally to the commission. They have all been made. The calculations show that if we go on with allocating even 35 percent free of charge—with the exception, of course, of the facilities we have already agreed on in the law, those of an infrastructural nature, we are simply going to allocate the basic assets free of charge—inflation will increase by about two or two and a half times. It all depends on the scale, of course, but roughly by two or two and half times.

"As for the consequences of privatization and destatification on employment, it is very hard to forecast. There are two basic factors. The first factor is that about 20 percent of our workers at enterprises, to judge from the time available [po fondu vremeni], are surplus to requirement. But that is to judge from the time available; it is very hard to say how many people are surplus. Some of them will certainly be forced out, and we must combine our program of destatification with a program of employment.

"As for the actual scale of unemployment, it is quite possible that within this program enterprises that have lost state support will (?most) frequently find themselves in a difficult financial situation, and bankruptcy. In the next few days we shall present you with a draft law on bankruptcy, which envisages special measures as to what is to be done in this case.

"As for a program of social protection for citizens, they need to be protected not only from privatization. We need to look at the problems of protecting and supporting citizens altogether in the context of the market economy. This idea exists, as you know. It has been discussed and been adopted as a basis by you yourselves—not only the one published under the aegis of the State Committee for Labor; it was adopted in the basic tenets for the transition to the market set out here by the president. We consider that it exists, and the question is only how best to take it into account when doing this work. I think that here we must simply coordinate: It is hardly worth making a special program. But this question must not be lost sight of." [end recording]

## Supreme Soviet Discusses Its Possible Demise

*LD0606083691 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 6 Jun 91*

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—The Soviet parliament observed the second anniversary since the beginning of its work early this week.

It took place in a rather ambiguous situation, created by the prospect of signing a new Union treaty which, according to the "nine plus one" agreement between the Soviet president and leaders of nine republics, is to be followed by the adoption of a new constitution and the election of new federal authorities. Thus, the document adopted last April actually dooms the present parliament to premature death.

Naturally, this prospect did not make federal legislators very optimistic, and they issued a special statement expressing their determination not only to take part in the discussion of the new Union treaty, but also to sign it as a kind of the 16th republic. The statement puts forward some demands which, according to the leaders of some republics, could block the process of reaching agreement.

Both participants in the "nine plus one" process and federal legislators themselves hold various views on this issue. For example, head of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin is stressing the "recommendation character" of suggestions of the federal parliament. At the same time, chairman of the federal parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov said that since the point at issue is the changing of the existing state and not the creation of a new one, the central authorities of the country have the right to take part in the signing of the new Union treaty. This stand was supported by Gorbachev in his recent speech in Alma-Ata.

Federal legislators regard their future in different ways. For instance, Yevgeniy Kogan, representative of the Soyuz (Union) group, believes that the "nine plus one" agreement is an attempt of a "soft coup", aimed at removing from power lawfully elected people's deputies.

This opinion is not shared by everyone. "The joint statement of the ten made it clear that we, people's deputies elected during the first stage of perestroika, are

to go before the end of the planned term," People's Deputy Ivan Vnebrachnyy wrote in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

The new Union treaty will define the role to be played by the federal parliament in conditions of the changing character and scope of the prerogatives of the centre. One thing is clear: The federal parliament has done a great deal in the sphere of law-making. A package of laws promoting the economic reform and guaranteeing political rights of citizens were adopted during the past two years. Issues dealing with a radical improvement of the Soviet federation were tackled.

Enormous experience has been accumulated, and one is certain to agree with Anatoliy Lukyanov that "the potential of the federal parliament has not been exhausted."

## Political & Social

### Lukyanov on Upcoming London Trip, Union Treaty

*LD0506180491 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—During a visit to Britain next week, Soviet Parliament Chairman Anatoly Lukyanov intends, when meeting the British prime minister, foreign secretary and the leadership of the country's parliament, to clear up matters concerning President Mikhail Gorbachev's participation in "the group of seven (G-7) summit in London.

Lukyanov announced this at a news conference in the Kremlin today in response to a question from TASS.

The purpose of the visit that will be made at the invitation of the British parliament is "to develop cooperation between the two- parliaments," Lukyanov said.

Touching upon the question of western economic aid to the Soviet Union, Lukyanov emphasised that "the main question is whether the G- 7 and all developed countries are prepared to give [word indistinct] aid."

He explained that the matter concerns to a larger extent not credits proper but their utilisation in such programs as the production of food and consumer goods defense industry conversion, the convertibility of the ruble, etc.; "I think that our talks with the G-7 will be conducted precisely with this, [word indistinct] Lukyanov said. At the same time he stressed that "if our country does not exert itself, no foreign financial injections would help."

Lukyanov said that work on a new "version of a union treaty had already been completed and today the president of the USSR sent it out to all members of the drafting committee for signature, after which it will be referred to the republican parliaments and the central parliament.

"This version of the union treaty delineates more clearly the powers of the union and republics and efficiently resolves the issue of property of the union and republics and taxation system. A taxation system will be a double-channel one and will consist of federal and municipal taxes," he said.

A union treaty may be signed in the coming two months, Lukyanov added.

At the news conference which was dedicated to the second anniversary of the Soviet parliament's work (the anniversary fell due on Monday), Lukyanov said that "over the period the parliament has become a stabilising centre of the life of the entire country" and that it had done a large amount of work, adopting 113 major laws dealing with such complex problems as property, leasing arrangements, entrepreneurship, etc.

### Yakovlev Believes Republics Will Secede

*AU0406125491 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 4 Jun 91 p 5*

[Report by Andreas Unterberger: "Russian-Style Divorce: One Will Get the Wardrobe"]

[Text] Vienna—Gorbachev adviser Aleksandr Yakovlev makes two essentially different strong impressions: On the one hand, he is the man who is directly at the center of Soviet power who does not even need the official title "Chief adviser of Mikhail Gorbachev" to radiate competence. The second impression is that there are so many questions without clear answers at this center of power, so that the Soviet Union is undoubtedly seeking cooperation with the West and trying to attract "foreign capital."

Yakovlev has come to Vienna to participate in the "Club 2" program of the ORF television network (ending a series on communism by ORF journalist Hugo Portisch) and was available for a broad analysis of Soviet reality in a lengthy talk during the night at the invitation of information director Kunz. The talk was mainly characterized by openness.

Referring to the intention of six republics to secede from the Soviet state, he stated: "Nobody has the strength to hold them back." After referenda on independence, there will be a divorce: "One will get the wardrobe, and somebody else the couch."

However, Yakovlev is mainly concerned about the 90 percent of the present-day Soviet Union that will continue to exist as one state. "Our goal is the integration of the Soviet Union in the international division of labor."

Will the Soviet Union go so far as to want to become a member of the EC? Yakovlev stressed: "I do not see any obstacles from our side. However, the EC will not agree to that." Europe has been playing the same game since

the times of Ivan III: "Sometimes we were not welcome in Europe, and sometimes we did not want to be part of Europe."

According to Yakovlev, it is true that military confrontation has come to an end, but "some do not like that." When asked by a PRESSE reporter to whom he was referring, he replied: "I have not often found idealists among generals. They are usually very efficient in their jobs." Administrative measures alone are not sufficient to reduce the generals' influence. "Their significance can only be reduced through successful disarmament measures and the establishment of new economic relations that put things in their proper place."

In view of these statements, it becomes clear why the Gorbachev adviser refrains from any criticism of Gorbachev's former opponent Yeltsin. There is a constructive basis for talks between Yeltsin and Gorbachev that chains the two together. They have no choice but to cooperate. Yakovlev also hinted (without mentioning names) that Yeltsin's election as Russian president might strengthen democracy in the country.

Why did foreign countries get the strong impression last fall that Gorbachev had come under the influence of antidemocratic "right" forces for a while? This was caused by the "stupid tactics of the left, with their call for Gorbachev's resignation. However, if Gorbachev resigns, we will immediately have dictatorship. The left has realized that now."

Whereas Yakovlev rightly advocated a quicker reduction of the Armed Forces during the talk—"There are serious discussions in our country about the introduction of a professional army"—he has nothing against the KGB. "The expenditure for the intelligence services is allegedly lower in our country than in the United States. This issue will certainly also be a topic of future talks with the West."

Yakovlev's tone became somewhat contemptuous when asked about the future role of the CPSU. "I do not believe in a strong future of the party." Asked how frustrated Mikhail Gorbachev was about the numerous adversities within and outside the party in the past few years, he stated: "If I had been in his place, I would have given up. However, he still has patience. In a country where everything was turned upside down in 70 years, one must have a great deal of strength." Yakovlev became even more dramatic, referring to calls by dogmatic circles that he and Gorbachev be brought to trial. "Giving up would mean death."

During the talk, he expressed serious concern about the economic situation. "We have many good laws now. Unfortunately, the people and the administration are not used to them. Many people just do not want to work any more. It is very difficult for them to adapt to the market economy. And in the administration there are too many officials who cling to their positions."

## Deputies Split on Market Protection for Press

*PM0506153391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report from the Kremlin by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "One Newspaper for the Whole Country?"]

[Text] On 31 May the draft Fundamentals of Civil Legislation were discussed for the third time in joint sittings of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This time too deputies needed more than an hour to cover the rest of the path. And finally this very important legal act, which will regulate relations in the transition to the market, was adopted.

Then A. Lukyanov, in the chair, gave the floor to B. Nikolskiy, deputy chairman of the Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals Committee, who read out an appeal to the country's Supreme Soviet. It states, in particular: "Our committee has recently received many appeals expressing acute alarm at the possibility of a new, compulsory increase in the prices of periodicals. With the participation of interested departments the committee examined at its sitting the situation in which the periodical press found itself at the time of the subscription campaign.

"Such a situation is created," Deputy Nikolskiy continued, "when, given the unpredictable increases in paper costs and the cost of Ministry of Communications services, newspaper and journal publishing houses and editorial boards can no longer guarantee to their subscribers that they will fulfill their commitments. A new sharp rise in the cost of paper and mail services will inevitably entail the economic stifling of many newspapers and journals, including popular ones and ones with long traditions. This would not only strike at glasnost but also do irreparable harm to Soviet culture."

In this connection the committee deems it necessary to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to charge the country's Cabinet of Ministers with examining without delay and adopting economic measures to ensure the stable working of the periodical press and the protection of subscribers' interests.

The chairman came out in support of that appeal, but there were opponents who doubt the legitimacy of such a step. Thus, Deputy N. Kostishin spoke out sharply against it, basing his position on the premise that in the conditions of the transition to the market the state's protection is being requested by precisely those people who expended so much vigor and energy on propagandizing precisely the market economy. His colleague, Deputy A. Kryshkin, was still more categorical: The newspaper and press industry, he is sure, is trying to get into market relations at the people's expense. And, as usual, on behalf of those same people he declared that the country will find a single newspaper quite enough,

and if all those bleating newspapers on sale at the parliamentary newsstand cease to exist then it serves them right.

At the end of the morning sitting the session participants adopted a resolution in which they charged the government and republic organs with investigating the situation which has arisen and endeavoring to find an acceptable solution.

### Responsibility for OMON Actions Pondered

*PM0506092191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Albert Plutnik "Political Diary:" "Is It True They Know Not What They Do? Protecting Laws by Lawful Methods Alone"]

[Text] Let us talk about the striking qualities of certain "explosive" incidents—very real explosions, onslaughts, and other acts or actions which, whenever they occur, make our overwrought society wince and bid farewell again to the hope that stability and order were on the point of being restored. The discussion is prompted by the publication in IZVESTIYA (Nos. 124 and 125) of two interviews by our correspondent I. Andreyev with USSR Internal Affairs Minister B. Pugo about the destruction of customs posts on the Latvian-Lithuanian and Latvian-Estonian borders. Not the actual pieces, but the aftermath—the reaction, pungent and anxious, of the readers. People are visiting and calling the editorial office, and they are sending us telegrams the spirit and burden of which is pretty accurately conveyed by one, for example, that came from Leningrad: "We, members of the 'Leningrad Platform' association of academics and writers, would like to express our opinion in your paper of USSR Internal Affairs Minister Pugo's utter incompetence and unscrupulousness in connection with the interviews. Kavtorin, Katerli, Strugatskiy, Ganelin, Yukhneva."

Readers suspect the minister of insincerity and unscrupulousness, since he refuses to believe that such a thing is possible in our country—that armed actions by the ministry's OMON [Special-Purpose Militia Detachment] units were a complete surprise to the minister himself. It cannot be, they believe. The minister had foreknowledge, and now he is deliberately misleading readers, trying to avoid being held responsible for the irresponsible actions of his subordinates. People cannot accept that in a department where discipline is one of the principal qualities of professionalism, someone might independently embark on actions with far-reaching consequences. Independently—without asking permission and without even considerinbg it necessary to inform the minister himself.

But this emotional perception of events, though it may appear entirely understandable, does not seem to me to be absolutely true. After all, why should we, without any significant grounds, doubt that the minister is telling the absolute truth? Why not acknowledge that he really did know nothing and really did assume that the allegations about OMON involvement in the violence against customs officers were mere gossip?

In short, let us believe him. He did not know, he did not sanction it. This is what the minister said, first to the paper and later in his reply to a deputy's question at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. In a reply that roundly condemns the republic authorities' actions, which directly contravene union legislation, and, at the same time, makes it clear that lawlessness should only be combated by legal methods. The minister clearly does not regard OMON actions to remove customs posts—carried out, as was specifically emphasized, without the knowledge of or an order from the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry—as legal methods.

So, let us leave the doubts aside—that is how it was. Let us be clear about that.

Then we are faced with an even more horrifying picture of actual paralysis of authority and of consequences that have already occurred and are yet to be. What we have in the country, apparently, is not some kind of illegal armed formations but perfectly legal state armed formations which are capable of being a reliable shield for some and a cudgel for others, without the knowledge of central state authority, totally independently, without requiring orders or recommendations, and when they think the time is right. While acting all the time, of course, on the side of the so-called "healthy forces." (Which forces are "healthy" and which are "sick" largely depends, as you will appreciate, on who makes the diagnosis. So a totally independent OMON is assuming the function of social and political diagnosis.) Acting, moreover, without any doubt about whether their operations are legal and legitimate, and therefore in no way hiding them from view. On the contrary, going all out to publicize them. (How else would the legendary experts from "600 Seconds" have managed to get to the scene of the future incident in time?)

So what about the strange general features of these extraordinary events. There are at least two. More details about the first, which has already been mentioned. It is something one encounters not infrequently in such situations—the amazing ill-informedness of the very central departments and individual officials whose actual job involves being the best informed about essential matters and the details of them. Not finding out about something later, but knowing in advance—that is why they are the authorities. But if everything looks different in reality, then we can assume one of two things: Either Nevzorov is in closer contact with OMON units than Pugo, or, in gratitude for past reports "about our boys," the OMON people are ever ready to participate in mass events to be conducted in accordance with their scenario.

It is indeed a fact that he who has the information holds sway.

Needlessly, it seems, did we lament the overcentralization of power in the country, the center's direction and

regulation of almost everything that happens in the provinces. Needlessly did we grieve, saying that there is no way this cornerstone of the bureaucratic-edict system can be shifted. It has been shifted. Apparently, it has already rolled so far away that one might even regret it. At any rate, it is by no means the sole event of recent times that makes one doubt whether the center, that is, Moscow, the Union government, and its departments, are even now a real force with whose permission or at least knowledge events are taking place Unionwide which determine the sociopolitical situation in the country.

No so long ago, as far as one remembers, the national salvation committees that appeared in the Baltic republics—with their secret aims and secret membership—were a total revelation to the central authorities (if, again, one gives credence to everything that was said at the time). Now we have a new surprise for the central departments, a theatrical one indeed—with conflagrations, din, and arm-twisting. A regular demonstration, arranged for television's contemporary chroniclers, to give them the opportunity to record the dynamic actions of select units of our valiant militia in critical situations, so to speak.... It would all be so funny were it not so serious. Say what you like, the central authorities, even given the all-conquering march of democratic principles and the ubiquitous celebration of sovereignty, must nonetheless have a firm notion of what is happening every day and every hour in every part of the "territory under its jurisdiction." Particularly when things could develop into bloodshed, when armed subunits are shaping to impinge on the complex and subtle process of sociopolitical life.

But it is time to mention the second characteristic feature of dramatic events of this kind, associated not so much with the place as with the time of the action. Although the place, too, is very important. They have a tendency always to occur in, I would say, amazingly inappropriate places, and, indeed, at amazingly inappropriate times. Inappropriate when seen from the viewpoint of those who sincerely want an atmosphere of reasonable, businesslike life to eventually triumph in society and the political struggle to eventually cease to be an end in itself for the opposing forces.

The events on our western borders somehow "suddenly" occurred at the very moment when a shaft of light was beginning to break through the clouds. Society had acquired hope as a result of the famous agreement which both the president and the nine signatory republics worked so hard to achieve. An agreement that determined the most realistic path to national accord and paved the way for a further quest for stability and tranquillity. At a time too when the other republics, groaning beneath the weight of their destiny, finally sensed how serious and desperate the situation was—convinced, it seems, of the impossibilty of clambering by themselves out of the ruins of economic collapse. So they strove toward this collective treaty and started to seek and propose their own individual forms of participation in common affairs... It was then that OMON stormed the customs posts. So who gave it the order? Who?

What alarmed readers most of all was the very possibility of the occurrence of "uncontrollable situations" in the country, hinted at by the internal affairs minister. They are asking a question which, to my mind, it would not hurt the president, the Cabinet of Ministers, the Security Council, and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to ask themselves: Who, if not state organs, is determining the course of events in this country?

## MVD on Necessity of Antiterrorism Units

*OW0506132991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] Speaking on Tuesday at a briefing at the press center of the USSR interior ministry, deputy chief of the ministry's criminal investigation department major general Beksoltan Dziov said that the number of crimes with the use of firearms and explosives sharply rose of late. Last year the increase in murders made up 25.6%, in serious injuries 36.7%, in banditry 40.1%. According to the interior ministry, the greatest number of grave crimes was registered in the Russian Federation, in Trans-Caucasus, Uzbekistan and Kirghizstan.

The main ways the criminals obtain their arms in are [as received] to seize or steal them from the premises of military units, disarm policemen or servicemen, buy arms from servicemen. According to the major-general, at the moment criminal elements are in the possession of 14,000 units of firearms.

Recently the motives for using arms changed, said the major-general. Arms were used mostly by hooligans and robbers. Now they are used largely by ethnic extremists.

For his part colonel Gennadiy Chebotarev, deputy chief of the ministry's 6th department, told newsmen that because of the growing terrorist acts it's necessary to heighten the effort to combat terrorism, up to forming special units following the example of other countries.

## MVD Official Says Train Blast 'Planned Action'

*OW0506025491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] As Deputy Chief of the USSR Interior Ministry's Criminal Investigation Department, Militia Major General Beksoltan Dziov [name as received] told IF [INTERFAX], the explosion in the Moscow-Baku train's last car, which occured at the Karlan-Yurt Station on May 30 "is likely to be a planned action."

However, the general did not make suggestions regarding committers of the explosion which left 12 people dead and nearly two dozen wounded.

According to B. Dziov, during the investigation, nationalities of those killed were established: six Dagestans, five Azerbaijanis, and one Armenian.

As IF reported earlier, the investigation is conducted by the Interior Ministry and the KGB.

An official representative of the USSR KGB told IF that "it is too early to characterize the explosion as a planned terrorist act."

### Validity of USSR Name Change Challenged

*PM0606085191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Article by Yevgeniy Spekhov under "My Opinion" rubric: "Causing Surprise and Evoking Caution...."]

[Text] Yesterday the newspapers, including ours, printed a TASS report entitled "Union Treaty: Preparations Are Continuing." The text is to the point, there is not a superfluous word. G.Kh. Shakhnazarov, assistant to the USSR President, comments on the progress of the work on the Union Treaty. According to his words, agreement was confirmed during the latest session of the preparatory committee on the question of the title of the future federation—the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics. In this context the opinion was voiced that in accordance with the results of the referendum it is necessary to retain the word "socialist." In reply to this it was argued that there are practically no countries left in the world which retain ideological symbols in their title. The amendment of the title is by no means evidence of a renunciation of socialist ideals, or of a refusal to implement the will of the people as expressed in the referendum, the president's assistant noted.

The latter is, of course, hard to believe. You and I, dear reader, know how unpredictable the utterances and actions of republic leaders can be.

The question lies elsewhere. Why are the clear-cut results of the referendum not taken into account by presidents and Supreme Soviet chairmen? The opinion of the people was sought—the majority expressed themselves in favor of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. You want to change the state's title? Go ahead, but consult those whose will you are implementing having been elected by them. It cannot be ruled out that tomorrow someone will take objection to other "ideological symbols"—the red flag, the hammer and sickle. There will be demands to replace them. And again a little group of presidents will decide what is to be done.

But this will not do. Democratically minded people also have the democratic right to express their opinion.

### Presidential Decree To Protect Press Likely

*LD0406135391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 p 1*

[RIA report: "We Approve CPSU Central Committee's Position!"]

[Text] "The press, which itself has done a great deal for the transition to market relations, must not suffer as a result of them," USSR People's Deputy Petr Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, declared at a news conference for local journalists.

He said that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is preparing a decision on problems of the press on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee. It is proposed that it will make provision for newsprint prices for all registered publications (not just party publications) to be fixed no higher than the present ones and for the state order for newsprint to be set at 70-75 percent. "If necessary, I believe that there will also be a corresponding presidential decree," the Central Committee secretary remarked.

### Officials Exploit Privatization in Kaliningrad

*OW0606075891 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 28 May 91*

[Video report by S. Chekalin; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] The economic reforms that are taking place in our country, unfortunately, give rise to many negative practices. Specifically, the numerous joint enterprises—this is not the first time that I have had to speak about it—do not produce any goods, but instead are used to stuff the pockets of those who created them. This applies to many private and small enterprises. As a matter of fact, this is happening all over the country, in the Far East, Central Asia, and in the west of our country. So, here is a report from Stanislav Chekalin from Kaliningrad, which I would ascribe to the genre of a television detective story.

[Begin Chekalin recording] These are Kaliningrad hotels. Everything began when their collectives leased them and then decided to privatize them; however, the Zhilkomkhoz [municipal housing establishment] association's general director Krashenko, and the Chairman of the Gorispolkom [city Soviet executive committee], Issayev forbade privatization, and they themselves headed a joint Soviet-West German enterprise for the operation, reconstruction, and building of new hotels. This administrative-elitist [administrativno-nomenklaturnaya] privatization has led to a big scandal.

Using this unfettered power, the two leaders formed an essentially bogus company called "Deyma," for their personal use as a channel for money from the city budget and from enterprises with foreign exchange.

By their own authority, they allocated this fashionable residence for the offices of the "SP" [company], rent-free, complete with a service staff that received 800-ruble salaries. Of course, they bought an expensive limousine and fine furniture from abroad. All these foreign currency expenditures were paid for by the hard labor of fishermen, who earned the foreign exchange. [Video shows office with two men working, a Hotel Konigsberg pamphlet, a passport page with German visa No. 13690226 and entry and exit stamps]

The pinnacle of the activities of these latter-day Ostap Benders [a swindler portrayed in I. Petrov's *Twelve Chairs*] was a trip to Essen, Germany, for which the schemers received nearly 75,000 rubles from the city budget, while an equivalent sum was paid to them in Deutsche marks by the unsuspecting German side. These elitist comrades falsified the Sheraton Hotel receipts in the most unabashed way by increasing each bill by seven days, and used a German typewriter to add the word "total" [i togo], which is not normally done in Germany. According to assessments by competent bodies, the furious activity in connection with the establishment of the sham "SP" [company], cost the Kaliningrad taxpayers 205,000 rubles and nearly 5,000 dollars, even though the reconstruction of the hotels was never started. [end recording]

## Sobchak Urges Creation of Social Democratic Union

*PM0506131591 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 20, 19 May 91 (Signed to Press 14 May) p 3*

[USSR People's Deputy Anatoliy Sobchak article: "We Are Losing Time, We Must Hurry"]

[Text] In the last issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI I was named as one of the people who in recent months have been nurturing the idea of a social democratic union. I would like to share my views on this score.

Democrats and simply sober-minded people who remain in the ranks of the CPSU under the old slogan of its renewal must finally face reality. The CPSU is by its very nature incapable of being reborn in the new society, just as the utopia underlying its primary tasks is unviable and force must somehow be used to drive people into it. Hence on the one hand the natural disarray within the party (let us recall Mikhail Gorbachev's words at the recent plenum to the effect that three or four parties were sitting in the hall), and on the other the increasingly militant and aggressive bids to retain power.

In my view, only the unification of the general democratic movement with social democratic ideas, which have a long history and attract major support in our society, is capable of leading to the creation of a serious alternative to the CPSU.

I imagine the technique for organizing this movement as follows: First of all it is necessary to proclaim the very idea of establishing a social democratic or general democratic union. It is necessary to state firmly that there will be a break with Bolshevik practice and that all the best of what was accumulated by the experience of Russian social democracy will be restored: the orientation toward social protection for people and social justice in all spheres of social life. The initiators in creating first a movement and then a party as well could be politicians well known in the country who hold general democratic, "left-centrist," and "centrist" views. Politicians of this sort exist even in the ranks of the Communist Party. They could be followed by millions of democratically inclined Communists who disagree with the reactionary and orthodox outlook of the current leaders.

The social democratic movement is not being set up from scratch. Much has been done by "Democratic Russia," which is striving to unite progressive forces. If "Democratic Russia" joins or states its support for this movement, its potential will increase substantially. I think that this movement is capable of becoming interrepublican, because ideas know no borders, and the goals of thoughtful people in the republics are the same.

I am also sure that a mass alternative party is also needed by forces which are far from the ideas of democracy. Major military industrialists and the most farsighted army and KGB generals understand, of course, what political imbalance in society may mean, first and foremost for themselves personally. However paradoxical it may seem, today even reactionaries and the orthodox need a strong and organized democracy. After all, spontaneous popular confrontation is fraught with general misfortune.

If a document-cum-appeal does indeed appear and if other democratic leaders join the founders and initiators, then we will be able to go through the first stage in establishing such a union. I stress that this will initially be a movement. We should not confront people with an unduly restrictive framework of choice—on the contrary, our union must extend the hand of cooperation to everyone.

The founding documents should appear at the second stage. Here it will be necessary to resolve a very important organizational problem: Without a permanently functioning apparatus we cannot achieve anything. But currently there is no apparatus, so the union's organizers must disperse around the country and begin building the cells of the future organization at the local level. Incidentally, the developing election campaign for the first president of Russia could have been used for this. Had the "Democratic Platform" been able to do all this a year ago, I am sure the situation in the country now would have been different.

The third stage is holding a founding congress. It should be held, it seems to me, no later than the end of summer or early fall.

If the first two stages pass off successfully and we manage to involve the democratic mass media in propagandizing the union, it will also be necessary to think about parliamentary support, about establishing groups of deputies espousing the union's platform.

Three basic political goals will be on the agenda of these parliamentary groups:

—It is ncecessary to conclude the new Union Treaty as soon as possible between those republics that wish to do so;

—A new USSR Constitution must be adopted as soon as possible on the basis of principles defining the new status of the mutual relations between sovereign republics and the center;

—It is necessary to ensure and hold talks among all Union organs of power as speedily as possible and ensure that the new Union structures are secondary in relation to the republics.

And if we concentrate on implementing this program now, we will be able to overcome the current political crisis before the end of the year.

### Poll Reveals Ambivalence on Nuclear Weapons

*OW0606031991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From "Viewpoint"]

[Text] According to the news agency "DATA", the National Public Opinion Studies Center took an opinion poll in March 1991 among 1953 persons representing the urban population of the USSR. They were offered [as received] to answer if they consider implementation by military servicemen of an order to fire on peaceful citizens to be crime.

61 percent said "yes".

23 percent do not think it is a crime.

17 percent did not give a clear answer.

In the same poll respondents were asked whether they agree or not with the assertion that the creation of nuclear weapons helped avert the 3rd World War.

31 percent agreed.

1 out of 4 said such assertion is wrong.

44 percent found it difficult to answer.

Margin of error—3 percent.

## Economic

### Shcherbakov Discusses Anticrisis Program

*PM0506105191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Jun 91 First Edition pp 1-2*

[Interview with USSR First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov by TASS observers V. Isachenkov and Yuriy Sizov; date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are introduction: "Vladimir Shcherbakov: Populism Is Ruinous to the Economy"]

[Text] The program of anticrisis measures prepared by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has met with a varied welcome from specialists. Some praise the document for clearly formulating allegiance to market principles but criticize it for its vagueness and fulsomeness while others again curse the government for insufficient radicalism and others accuse it of trying to "capitalize" the country.

TASS observers Vladimir Isachenkov and Yuriy Sizov met with Vladimir Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy prime minister and minister of the economy and forecasting, and asked him to comment on the main provisions of the government program.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] The drastic reduction of budgetary expenditure, the rapid development of commercial credit, the sale of above-norm stocks of raw and semifinished materials to the population... These and other elements contained in the government's anticrisis program are essentially similar to those proposed in the "500-day" program. In terms of their toughness many of the provisions of the anticrisis program are not inferior to the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program. To what extent was the "500-day" program used in preparing the present program of the Cabinet of Ministers?

[Shcherbakov] We did indeed make very active use of the "500-day" program and other alternative documents. I asserted even before that the "500-day" program contained very many rational ideas and radical solutions. But it had major shortcomings, so I do not agree with those who believe that it should have been adopted without any changes.

I would rate as the biggest shortcoming the fact that the "500-day" program was based on the economic plane on good and even comprehensibly linked ideas but essentially was prepared in a vacuum. It was made by people who know in theory how to resolve the problems facing the country but have no practical idea what must be done and the consequences to which this will lead. I assess highly the economic training and theoretical knowledge of the authors of the "500-day" but I can see a certain impracticality connected with the lack of experience of work at enterprises and in the management system. In addition the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program was to a considerable extent abstract in the sense that it was absolutely unclear what stood behind each phrase.

For instance, it is impossible to resolve in three months the question of destatization with the absence of the relevant legal acts. It was absolutely unclear from the "500-day" program on what principles destatization should be carried out and how to share out state property. That is why from the outset I believed it necessary to make this and other provisions more specific.

In addition the "500-day" program elaborated only extremely feebly questions of social protection. I am surprised by the behavior of those who shared and supported this program but then cursed the present Cabinet of Ministers for insufficient compensation for the increase in retail prices. After all the "500-day" program suggested consistently liberalizing prices and not providing any compensation. It is hard to believe that it is possible to create a market economy without resolving social problems.

As for toughness, after all it is a case of a program of anticrisis measures. The country is sliding increasingly rapidly into crisis. What is happening now is not yet a crisis but merely the first and, I think, the slightest manifestation of it. We must stop the sliding "snow ball" so that it does not become an avalanche and that cannot be done using "soft" methods.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] During the discussion of the "500-day" program its authors stressed that the most important means for easing the transition to the market for the country's population are the privatization and sale of state resources. These measures are also in the present program. In your assessment, how great will be their positive effect?

[Shcherbakov] It is hardly possible to achieve the complete recovery of the economy thanks solely to privatization. Even Margaret Thatcher took 10 years to privatize just 10 percent of enterprises.

The impossibility of rapid privatization has also been confirmed by our own experience. For instance, the sale of housing in Moscow. So far even the documents on whose basis the sale should take place have not been adopted. Privatization cannot be viewed as a preliminary condition of the liberalization of prices and other market measures. They should be implemented in parallel.

According to the most optimistic assessments the population will be able to release about 100 billion rubles [R] for privatization. A very great deal depends on how the situation develops in the country.

Let us even suppose that, in addition to the free R100 billion, the population spends a further R100 billion from the consumption fund on privatization. Yet the cost of fixed capital in the country as a whole is assessed at R2.5 trillion. Even if the population removes all its money from the savings books, including the savings of old women and child benefits, this sum will total only R350-400 billion. But after all no one will do that.

Pure privatization will not produce tangible results in less than 15 years. Destatization is far more important. It is here that it is possible to achieve rapid results. The government has proposed forms like leasing with the right to purchase, credit for purchasing, the creation of joint-stock and holding companies, and so forth. We must encourage this process in order within two years to achieve the destatization of at least two-thirds of enterprises. Put that way the task is at least feasible, albeit very difficult.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] The recent USSR Supreme Soviet discussion of the draft law on privatization prepared by the government shows that the idea of the free issue of state property is quite popular. Does the government completely reject it?

[Shcherbakov] Like any populist idea, the proposal for free privatization sounds very alluring but it is not feasible in practice, except for specific spheres like housing, for instance. Thus, the approach toward the privatization of housing elaborated in Russia is very sensible and is a good basis for further work. As for the proposal to issue the population with a certain proportion of state property in the form of certificates—that gives rise to a very great many questions. The first is: On what principle should they be issued?

It is clear that there are no criteria for issuing them. We shall constantly quarrel but we shall still not find them. There is also a second question: How to share out state property among the republics? After all, taxes were collected from the whole country and the prices policy was common to all. But in the share-out a Russian innabitant will receive R7,000 and an inhabitant of Tajikistan R700. Will the peoples agree to this form of share-out?

In brief, many questions arise to which there are no ready answers. For instance, how to divide the Volga Truck Plant, in which $3 billion have been invested, or a nuclear electric power station?

Let's try and assess also the social aspect of this problem. In the country 25 percent of the population lives below the poverty line. Imagine that a man receives a share. He simply does not need it, but he needs to feed his family every day, and money is constantly in short supply. One fine day he decides to sell the share. Many certificates will be put on the market and the demand for them will be small, because the number of rich people in our country is small. As a result prices for these certificates will fall to a few percent of their nominal value and the result will be that the shadow economy dealers will buy up everything for a trifle. They say, let's ban their sale for five to six years. But we are not naive children. We realize that this will only reduce the value of the certificates still further.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] The Cabinet of Ministers program provides for indexing at the budget's expense only the incomes of the most vulnerable strata of the population—pensions, allowances, and grants and also the wages of employees in budget-financed organizations. Yet a wages increase is now being demanded by virtually everyone and, having increased the wages of miners and air traffic controllers, the government will encounter new demands from the workers in other sectors and regions. Will the Cabinet of Ministers be able to resist the demands for an increase in wages and if not will that not lead to hyperinflation?

[Shcherbakov] Classic indexing implies an automatic increase in incomes. It proceeds from the premise that the structural relationships between these incomes will not change. But in our country all these proportions are extremely distorted. It is essential above all to display a sensible approach and equalize the conditions for the receipt of incomes by different social groups.

A miner employed in production for virtually 12 hours a day cannot receive R420 a month while a middleman

who sells state beer at R1.5 [per liter] gets that amount in one day. Or take, for instance, the work of a fitter, who now receives the same as a miner each month. After all that is also unfair: The fitter works under completely different conditions and can sell his output at contract prices while the miner has fixed prices and mining and geological conditions. Understandably, it is a case not of reducing the fitter's wages but of increasing the miner's. They cannot be put on an equal footing by paying them equal compensation. That is why the indexing method in its pure form is unsuitable for the country.

But even if we imagine that the proportions are correct, why should we automatically increase everyone's income as prices increase? If we embark on that path, then the country will never emerge from hyperinflation. Its pace will be thousands of percentage points a year. The only way of breaking the hyperinflation spiral is to ensure that the growth of prices is basically covered by the growth of labor productivity, then that will lead to the influx of goods.

I want to stress once again that there is no possibility of raising the incomes of all categories of the population automatically, nor is there any sense in doing so. Embarking on the method of total indexing would be a very big mistake, because that would mean embarking on the path of social dependence.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] The government program provides for the implementation of a course toward the active enlistment of foreign investments. In your view is it possible that there will be a tangible increase in these investments in the immediate future?

[Shcherbakov] I am sure it is. I am convinced of that by meetings with Western businessmen who, it is true, do make certain conditions. First, they demand an end to the "war of laws." Second, they ask that guarantees be given of the inviolability of capital investments. Third and last, they are seeking authorization to export profits and the output produced.

In particular there are many proposals for the development of natural gas deposits. But here our Western partners are naturally interested in the right to export some of the output. The program also provides for the possibility of turning ruble profits into currency profits at auction and their subsequent export abroad.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] As is well known, politics is the art of the possible. What, in your view, is it intolerable to exclude from the government program in any circumstances?

[Shcherbakov] I would highlight two elements. First. I would not agree to the proposals for the population's social protection being left out of the program. That block can be discussed and debated but in no case must it be abandoned. Otherwise the whole program will be as unfeasible as the "500 days."

And the second point. I believe it extraordinarily important to retain all measures for the economy's financial recovery. It is a balanced structure from which not a single brick can be removed.

I am sure that if we do everything we have planned, within 18 months to two years the situation will be completely different. Of course, the program will be amended as matters proceed. It is a plan of actions, not a dogma. The basic idea, the mainstream, the line, remains, but an enormous number of nuances will emerge.

## Aeroflot Faces Stiff Competition From Airlines

*OW0606044691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From "Business News"]

[Text] Foreign capital is muscling into the Soviet air passenger traffic while state-owned company Aeroflot, recently a monopoly on the Soviet market, is facing ever stiffening competition from airlines eager to cut into its hard currency revenues.

### Space for Joint Projects: From Airlines To Ready Breakfasts.

The biggest air traffic project in the Soviet Union to date has been started by the British Airways that signed a memorandum on the possible establishment of an international airline Air Russia last year with the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and Russia's Transport Ministry. Reportedly, the British investment may be equal to some 20 mln. pounds sterling, which is less than half the setting-up capital.

Air Russia plans to go into business even before 1992 is out and to fly to Europe, North America, Southeast Asia and the Far East. The joint venture plans to build an international terminal and to found a leasing company at Moscow' biggest airport Domodedovo.

The state-owned company Aeroflot, constantly under attack for the low-level services it offers to passengers, is also on a hunt for foreign partners. At present it is taking part in some 20 joint ventures, with its joint venture with the Irish compay Air Rianta International being the most profitable. Air Rianta International brought the turnover of tax-free trade shops at the Sheremetyevo Aiport in Moscow to $40 mln. last year.

The US Mariott in-flight services set up this country's first joint venture to offer in-flight service to passengers. The US company made public its plans to supply annually 3.5 mln. units of food for in-flight catering for Aeroflot and foreign airlines.

Aeroflot also established a joint Soviet-Swiss company, Aeroleasing, that specializes in servicing businessmen. One hour of flight aboard a chartered Falcon or a Soviet Yak-40 is estimated at $3000 to $4000.

The Bershader International of Belgium invested $900,000 (49 percent of capital base) in a joint venture servicing transit passengers in Moscow.

**Obsolete Aircraft Fleet**

Short on efficient and comfortable long-distance planes, the Aeroflot signed last year leasing contracts worth $0.5 bln. with West Europe's Airbus Industries and a western bank consortium, under which the Soviet Union will lease 5 wide-bodied A-310 airplnes for 10 years when each plane will become Aeroflot property (in case $100 mln. is paid for each vehicle).

A second way is to equip new Soviet planes with engines that enjoy a good reputation in the world. For example, the export version of the new medium-distance Tu-204 will be equipped with Rolls Royce engine RB 211-535.

The same British company will sell engines for Ka-62p helicopters, and long-distance aircraft will be equipped with US-made engines.

**Soviet Aircraft In The West**

Soviet aircraft companies have a good image in the West. Under a protocol signed with the British Aerospace, the possibility is being considered to use the Soviet super-heavy-duty airplane An-225 to lift off the British space shuttle. The project is estimated at $2.4 bln.

The state corporation Israel Aircraft Industries is negotiating the development of a passenger plane, with the US to manufacture the engines, the USSR, the body, and Israel, electronics.

## Statistics Show Increasing Production Slump

*OW0606045691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] This May's output was 3.1 percent down on the same month last year. Estimates by the government statistical committee of the Russian Federation, just published in Moscow-based Ekonomika I Zhizn, say the falling rate was the same as in April.

Production shrinkage was caused by the recent coal strike affecting steel-manufacturing industries. The negative trend is said to have continued in May as well. Pig iron, steel, and iron ore were 17 percent, 16 percent and 11 percent down on the previous year respectively.

A 2 percent slump in coal output in May has largely affected the country's power engineering. Oil production fell by 11 percent but gas was 2 percent up.

The chemicals and timber industries showed a 4.9 percent slump on 1990.

However, there was a slight improvement in the production of household equipment: TV-sets, washing machines and sewing machines were 1 percent, 6 percent and 4 percent up in may respectively. But the light industry performed worse: cotton and woolen textiles, and footwear were 7 percent 14 percent and 12 percent down respectively.

## Westerners Can Participate in Privatization

*OW0606082791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From the "Business Today" feature]

[Text] Mikhail Malei, deputy Chairman of Russia's Council of Ministers and Chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] state committee for the management of state property, made public the terms on which western investors can take part in the privatisation of Russian property.

Speaking in Moscow to the first Assembly of Russia's Business Circles, Malei said that 250 billion rubles worth of property would be offered for sale at the first stage of the privatisation, to be bought for special registered cheques every Russian citizen will be entitled to. "At the first stage the work collectives willing to buy their enterprises will have a priority right to the property," said Malei.

Foreign companies may come into the picture at the second stage, according to the Chairman of the Russian State Committee. The shareholder companies western companies may be interested in will be authorized to issue more stock to be sold for hard currency. The value of these enterprises basic assets will be estimated in accordance with market-determined prices and with the participation of western consultative companies, with the controlling interest remaining in the hands of the enterprise owners. Concurrently, the Russian government plans to float part of the stock at the world stock exchanges in order to "probe into response from western business circles". According to Malei, part of the western companies interested in long-term presence on the Soviet market are willing to buy this stock.

Several Soviet enterprises are already estimating the value of their property by western standards, said Malei. For example, the VAZ shareholder company (an automobile maker) has already paid $250,000 for such work.

## Government To License Oil, Gas Production

*OW0606083091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From the "Business Today" feature]

[Text] The central parliament in Moscow has adopted two resolutions defining lists of products banned for free sale and of operations subject to government licencing. The deputy prime minister, Mr. Yuriy Maslyukov, said the two lists took into account the interests of national security as well as of state, public and ecological safety.

There are 16 positions in the list of products and industrial waste banned for free sale. These include precious and rare-earth metals, military and missile technology, strategic minerals, radioactive and explosive waste as well as waste containing precious metals and jewels. The list of strategic materials is to come under an annual review by the government.

The licensing list includes 21 positions, among them:

—gas and oil production, processing and sales;

—extraction of precious and rare-earth metals as well as manufacture, purchase or sale of articles made from them;

—collection and processing of waste containing precious metals and jewels;

—design, construction and maintenance of major pipelines, bridges and tunnels;

—brokerage in foreign trade operations.

Under the government proposal, licences will be issued by the USSR state property fund and appropriate services on republican and regional levels. The paid licences are issued for a minimum 5-year period. Mr. Maslyukov said the restrictions cover all forms of ownership and that the suspension of a licence could be argued in court.

Simultaneously, the Supreme Soviet made up a rough list of operations subject to licensing by union and autonomous republics.

However, the two resolutions may be amended within months because of plans by a number of union republics, especially the Russian Federation, to establish control over the production and sale of oil and gas on their territory. Russian government officials say the oil and gas industries may soon fall under Russia's own jurisdiction.

## Agriculture

### Gorbachev, Nazarbayev Confer in Kokchetav

*914B0179B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian*
*30 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Suslikov: "M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Kazakhstan"]

[Text] Kokchetav—The journey of the country's president through Kazakhstan continues. On the morning of 29 May he left Kokchetav for Chimkent.

The night before there was a ceremony to place wreathes on the monument to Lenin in the central square of Kokchetav, and there were brief meetings with Kokchetav residents on the streets, in the stores, and in rural houses.

In the evening at the field camp of the Zlatopolskiy Sovkhoz [state farm] a detailed discussion was held with rural businessmen: lessors, cooperative members, farmers... The surprising thing was that this time the latter did not make their traditional requests for the president to "subsidize" them with slate, technical equipment, or fertilizers. The people who came to the field camp were not millionaires yet, but still they had in their bank accounts tens or even hundreds of thousands of rubles, which they could spend at their own discretion: They could purchase their own technical equipment and fertilizers, they could establish their own small enterprises and cooperatives, or they could pay for the services of intermediaries. They knew their worth and therefore, apparently, did not think they could turn the president of an immense power into a sovkhoz supplier. This meeting was much more important for them.

For the farmers of the virgin land of Kazakhstan, with its agricultural fields extending as far as the eye can see, perhaps, the torturous process of searching for their own path is coming to an end. All these years they have frequently groped their way through: from the brigade contract to intrafarm leasing with so- called calculated prices—prices, as a rule, plucked out of thin air in the director's office; to leasing means of production and gradual purchase of these means, again through leasing; to leasing and through it to independent Western-style farming, the rural cooperative, the association of small enterprises, the cooperative of cooperatives. Theoretically, it was all extremely simple: Give the peasant a bank account and the right to dispose of what he earns (permit buying and selling), and the peasant will take care of all the rest for himself. He will choose his own form of management, figure out the technology for the production of agricultural products, find channels for selling them, and select partners who think as he does. Everything here will depend not on the director's caprice or whim but on the peasant's experience, temperament, and knowledge as well as local conditions.

What united the rural businessmen in the field camp at Zlatopolskiy? The desire for maximum profit with minimum expenditures. But each of them achieved his own maximum with the minimum in his own way. The Niva leasing collective on the Zlatopolskiy Sovkhoz, which essentially became a rural cooperative long ago, spent 200,000 rubles [R] on technical equipment last year. They established good ties with the Omsk branch of the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture and obtained good seeds of a new strain of wheat. With the help of the scientists, they worked out new technology for cultivating the crop and still they received a million in profit! Farmer Ye. Nurtazin is an individualist, and he obtained the same 3,000 tons of milk per cow as they did on the sovkhoz, but it cost him one-third as much to produce his milk. How? "A company secret," the farmer joked, "but I can sell it..."

These people were united to the president of the country, in my view, by their understanding of one very simple idea. It is impossible to build a market on an individual sovkhoz or even oblast. This is why they did not ask the president for technical equipment or fertilizer this time.

Why? They would rather have the right conditions be created so they could do these things themselves, so that they could work and do their business.

The dialogue between M.S. Gorbachev and lessor G. Didenko had a half-joking but still serious subtext.

"We had two intensive labor collectives or, as they say, KIT's. One engaged in feed production and the other in animal husbandry. They looked over the possibilities and came to the conclusion that they had to cooperate and unite the KIT's."

"And you had to have three KIT's," Gorbachev joked.

"You guessed it, but the third KIT was your business as president. They were your problems. The country could not get by with one or two KIT's; there had to be three. Stability, the elimination of interethnic hostility, the creation of conditions for normal work in the country."

It ended with the two presidents, Gorbachev and Nazarbayev, shaking hands and promising the rural businessmen that they would do everything possible to create the necessary legal, economic, and other conditions for the development of market relations. And preserve the Union.

But there are still plenty of problems. The administrative system slows things down, the middle level of sovkhoz specialists trips up the lessors, the inequivalent exchange with the cities harms the interests of the peasants, since, as in the olden days, it charges the rural areas excessively high prices for poor-quality equipment. Monopolies are suffocating small business. Just take that same Niva leasing collective, which appears to be flourishing. They—20 machine operators—earned a whole million, but how? They grew a good crop, they "processed" the grain, they put the grain in sacks themselves, and they shipped it and sold it themselves, mainly as seeds.

"If we had simply sold the grain, we would have received R125,000 instead of R1 million, we would have been ruined, and that would have been it," said the Niva leader, A. Gardner.

This episode went unnoticed. Alas, even Niva is flourishing today not because it is working well and obtaining good harvests but because it trades its grain as seeds. It has a monopoly. And if quotas were established the situation could change drastically. The collective, even if it were doing excellent work, would go down the tube. Is this really normal?

The discussion in the field camp was useful for both presidents. In any case Gorbachev promised the businessmen that he would think about the problems that were raised so he could give a serious answer to them in his speech which, according to plan, is to take place at the culmination of his visit in the capital of Kazakhstan—Alma-Ata.

## Prime Minister Cited on Private, State Farming

*PM0506150791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by K. Aksenov: "Pavlov in Kuban"]

[Excerpts] Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov has arrived in the Kuban. He has arrived here for a plenum of the Central Board of the All-Union Economic Society, which he heads. [passage omitted]

Answering your PRAVDA correspondent's question on the government's attitude toward private farming, Pavlov said that the course toward a mixed economy in the countryside does not mean that a campaign will be waged against the existing kolkhozes and sovkhozes. In the next few years they will be the main providers of the people's food.

## Late-May Weather, Crop Status Reviewed

*PM0506153591 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Jun 91 p 5*

[Agrometeorologist S. Malikova "Weather and Crops" report]

[Text] In the western half of the country's European territory cool and rainy weather persisted during the last third of May. In some places ground and air frosts were observed. They damaged or destroyed potato shoots and vegetable crop seedlings. In the eastern half very warm weather prevailed. In most of the Urals, the Volga-Vyatka, and the Volga regions maximum air temperatures were between 30 and 33 degrees.

Heavy precipitation caused flooding and flattening of crops in some places, and plant damage in others.

South of the line linking Vilnius, Smolensk, Ivanovo, and Kirov winter rye formed ears. Wheat began to form ears in the Ukraine (excluding western oblasts), in Moldova, the Volga region (south of Penza), and in the extreme south of the Urals. Further north, stem growth continued on winter cereals. And in the extreme south of the USSR's European territory they flowered. Tillering and stem growth were observed on early spring crops. Mass leaf formation set in on corn in southern rayons, and potato shoots appeared in the same area.

In the Baltic republics and Belorussia, and in the north of the Central and North-West regions apple trees continued blossoming and in some places blossoming was ending. South of the line linking Chernovtsy, Nikolayev, Poltava, Zaporozhye, and Saratov fruit formation and growth is under way. Flower cluster formation continued on vines, and flowering began. In a number of places flower clusters formed on clover, while further north stem growth continued. Alfafa began to flower in the North Caucasus and in the Volga region, while in the extreme south this crop was beginning to grow again after the first mowings.

In the Transcaucasian republics cold and rainy weather prevailed. The most copious precipitation (40-70 mm, and 100 mm and more in some places) occurred in a number of rayons in Georgia, and locally in the north of Armenia and Azerbaijan. Because of the rains and waterlogged ground, conditions for field work were unfavorable.

In most of the northern half of Kazakhstan and in Tyumen and Omsk Oblasts the weather was hot and mainly dry. Average air temperatures for the 10-day period were 3 to 6 degrees above the long-term average.

Cool and rainy weather also prevailed in the agricultural regions of East Siberia. Ground and air frosts were observed everywhere. Precipitation hampered field work. Spring grain crops have started sprouting. Potato planting continues.

In Central Asian republics and the southern half of Kazakhstan heavy rain fell during most of the 10-day period, accompanied by hail in some places. Toward the end of the 10-day period it got warmer.

## Public Sector Potato, Vegetable Sowing Wanes

*PM0506152191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report prepared by V. Konovalov on basis of reports by USSR State Committee for Statistics and IZVESTIYA correspondents: "Will We Have Vegetables and Potatoes in Winter?"]

[Text] I would like to gladden readers with the hope that things will soon be all right for us with regard to vegetables and potatoes. Hope founded on reports like this one, for example, from Volgograd Oblast: Potatoes already occupy 17 percent more arable land than a year ago, and vegetables 45 percent more. People are also pressing ahead with potato planting in Chelyabinsk Oblast. But.... There are not so many of these small islands promising prosperity amid the boundless expanses. Alarming reports are far more typical.

So far vegetables have been planted on only one-fourth of the planned area in Kursk Oblast, while potatoes occupy just 2,900 hectares there—less than half the area of last year's crops. There are even entire rayons (Solntsevskiy and Cheremisinovskiy Rayons) where not a single hundredth of a hectare in the collective and state farm fields has yet been planted with potatoes.

Seed potatoes have been planted on just 26,000 of the planned 45,000 hectares in Nizhniy Novgorod Oblast. Reporting these data, our correspondent A. Yershov asked for it to be specially pointed out that last year the oblast's farms cultivated the "second grain" [potatoes] not on 45,000 but on 67,000 hectares, but a huge part of the plantations (11,000 hectares) disappeared under snow. And not only because of bad weather. They were let down by the former "patrons." They were unable (or did not particularly want?) to come to an arrangement with city folk with regard to assistance this year either.

A similar situation is taking shape in many other parts of the country. The latest summary by the USSR State Committee for Statistics confirms this most definitely.

In the country as a whole potatoes occupied 1.6 million hectares by 27 May—2.1 million hectares last year. Vegetables had been planted on 700,000 hectares—100,000 less than last year. And, of course, the picture is no better when broken down among the republics. In the Russian Federation potatoes had been planted on 790,000 hectares (1.1 million hectares last year), in the Ukraine on 361,000 hectares (423,000 a year ago), and in Belorussia on 231,000 hectares (283,000 before).

The state of affairs on vegetable plantations is not gratifying either. In Russia vegetable crops occupy 245,000 hectares (291,000 before), in the Ukraine 250,000 hectares (286,000).... Only farmers in Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan have planted a little more vegetable crops than last year—74,000 hectares (70,000 before) and 25,000 hectares (24,000) respectively.

There is no need to dwell on an analysis of the reasons—they are well known, and they have long been known to everyone. For many years we showed extremely little concern for equipping this sector with equipment and modern technologies. It was taking shape and did take shape in our country as the heaviest, "manual" sector, geared to involving a vast number of people from the cities and from industrial enterprises. Today we know what this involvement means.

But this is what is interesting. The situation is alarming, but the leaders of many oblasts do not consider it alarming at all. In Bashkiria, for example, the potato fields will be reduced by one-fourth. However, R. Khakimov, republic deputy minister of agriculture, convinced our correspondent A. Zinovyev—not unsubstantiatedly but with calculations at hand—that potato production will not fall there. The thing is that 157 special-technique complexes, which use Dutch technology to cultivate potatoes, have been set to work. And this, so the deputy minister assured him, is a guarantee of yields of at least 300 quintals per hectare over an area of 7,000-8,000 hectares.

Altay farmers hope to make up for the losses from undersowing thanks to the same Dutch technology, which has been used on one-third of the areas occupied by potatoes. God grant that it will be so!

But, to be honest, many people today pin far stronger hopes on private truck gardens. In Voronezh Oblast, for example, potato fields in the public sector have diminished by 4,200 hectares compared with 1990. Specialists maintain, however, that the total production of the "second grain" must even increase. Yes, precisely thanks to the "private operators" who have obtained land. And

it is believed there that private truck gardens will provide approximately one-fourth of the gross yield of vegetables.

The truck garden boom is everywhere today. People well understand that they should now rely on themselves above all. And so they set out after work and on their days off to their allotments with spades and rakes. Of course, this is certainly not the full solution to the food problem but rather an escape from possible interruptions in food supplies. Only a radical agrarian reform, which will lead to the creation of a viable structure of agriculture, can really help us.

## Military

### U.S. Threat, Performance in Gulf War Viewed

*91UM0698A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 91 First Edition p 3*

[Article by Major M. Pogorelyy under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Judgments": "Chocolate or Bombs"]

[Text] Several days ago, a novelty in the "outfitting" of the U.S. Armed Forces was reported—"heat-resistant" chocolate which does not melt at temperatures of up to 60 degrees Centigrade. It was stressed in particular that its adoption by the troops is associated with hostilities in the Persian Gulf area...

Of course, the influence of the war in the Middle East on the development of the military art in the United States and in the West as a whole does not boil down to this curiosity. We may name quite a number of novelties in the arsenals of the United States and its allies which were used in a real combat environment for the first time. They include precision missiles and aerial bombs, planes built on the basis of Stealth technology (so-called "invisible"), space-based systems for intelligence gathering, communications, command and control of troops and weapons, and so on.

However, if we take a closer look, we may find that systems which have been in service with the Western armies for five to 10, or even more years (such as, for example, the B-52), and which have long been tested and fine-tuned, were the main "workhorses" in the Gulf. The war in the Gulf became rather like a colossal testing ground as far as "supermodern and superprecise superweapons" are concerned, which our "independent" military experts hastened to admire enthusiastically following the propaganda and advertising footage of CNN. Some weapons acquitted themselves well; other models of weapons, including those represented by just a few copies, showed graphically that they are in need of serious additional work.

Let us look at, for example, precision laser-guided aerial bombs GBU-28, designed especially for destroying protected command posts and communications facilities of the enemy. The Americans took two of these bombs to the war. One of them did not hit the target for some reason. The other hit a bomb shelter with several hundred Iraqi old people, women, and children. How can the effectiveness of these bombs be evaluated? The accuracy coefficient [koeffitsient porazheniya] of other precision weapons systems came to about 30 percent, testing-ground results being 80 to 90 percent.

Also, let us look at the Patriot, on the account of which there was so much admiration. For example, as Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives L. Aspin admitted, it is rather the psychological impact of this system of antimissile defense that was valuable. The point is that the Patriot, which was used as an antimissile missile, hit the propulsion systems of Scuds. As a result, the warheads came down on the streets of cities or other facilities and did the same damage they would have done without the counteraction of the Patriots. What if, God forbid, the Scuds had been carrying chemical weapons, or nuclear weapons?

I am not trying to create the impression among our readers that Americans and their allies fought haphazardly using this or that. They, primarily professional servicemen, showed themselves to be well-trained soldiers who carried out in an efficient manner, the orders of the political leadership. Their training, their attitudes towards combat as their business, their jobs played by far a not insignificant role in attaining the military and political goals of the war. We should also note that in the last decade both foreign and military policies of the United States were geared to not only a large military confrontation, for example, in Europe, but also to participation in low-intensity conflicts, that is, local and regional conflicts. Appropriate scenarios were worked on and fine-tuned ahead of time (Lebanon, Grenada, Panama, and numerous annual exercises).

Frankly, the fact that Washington is so disposed to proven patterns puts us on our guard, especially now that jingoistic attitudes spawned by the victory are on the rise in America, whereas, on the other hand, the brakes of the "Vietnam syndrome," which to a considerable degree restrained the United States from becoming involved in large-scale military actions, are gone. Such vigilance also arises in conjunction with the fact that the United States has started talking about "a new world order." The principle "America above all," and the conviction that this country should, and is able, to govern the world virtually single-handedly are seen there as the cornerstone of this order. Also, this position is based on the conviction that force is definitely needed for resolving conflicts.

A force-based approach to resolving possible conflicts in the long term can be clearly traced using, once again, the Middle East as an example. While politicians are engaged in shuttle diplomacy, attempting to weave a cobweb of peace treaties, the Pentagon is concerned with issues of a more mundane nature—setting up weapons

and combat materiel depots for, at a minimum, one division of its ground forces on the territory of Saudi Arabia, an air base for one or two aviation wings, and other installations designed for "the deployment of American troops," as the U.S. secretary of defense diplomatically called forward bases. It is also planned to hold regular exercises of the contingents of U.S. Armed Forces with their allies in the Persian Gulf area, which actually means their almost permanent presence there. Apparently, there is a reason why R. Cheney stated that the troops are being withdrawn, but U.S. military presence in the area will... expand.

This trend is also being manifested in an increase in the stream of armaments to the countries of the Near and Middle East. Thus, Washington has already undertaken to deliver new armaments to Israel and Saudi Arabia. Other requests, which are quite numerous, for a total of more than $30 billion, are being studied, and will almost certainly also be met. It is with regard to third countries that the U.S. leadership allows itself to moralize. Thus, speaking three days ago at Yale University, Bush voiced his dissatisfaction with the fact that China sells weapons to the countries of the Middle East. What about the United States itself? The Congress does not envisage restrictions on the exports of weapons, explaining this by the fact that "it is impossible to control the influx of conventional armaments to the region." That is to say, "What Jupiter is allowed to do..."

Something else is interesting. When it is necessary to sell its wares, the White House vociferously advertises "a substantial gap between Western and Soviet military systems," which supposedly was decisive for the success of "Desert Storm." However, the Pentagon chief has no compunction about recalling that "the Soviets still retain a tremendous military potential" in order to assure appropriations.

Unlike R. Cheney, not all people, far from all, continue to believe in the "Soviet threat." This is why American legislators, in the course of parliamentary battles over the 1992 budget, staunchly disagree with the plans of the administration to deploy an armada consisting of 75 B-2s, and propose to almost halve the funds for continuing work under the SDI program.

Many sober-minded politicians recognize that four decades of the arms race did not pass without a trace even for a state as rich as the United States. The state debt has already reached $760 billion by now; West European and Japanese companies are penetrating the American market more and more vigorously. In conjunction with this, the outrage of Congressman D. Bonior with the fact that the United States "continues to pay for the defense of the countries which are the leading economic powers of the world" is understandable. This is why the House of Representatives recommended that the President reduce the number of American servicemen in Europe by 1995 to approximately 100,000, all the more so because there will be no Soviet troops in Eastern Europe by this time. However, in his words, Bush himself shares the view of Chancellor Kohl who believes that "it is also important in the future for the United States to maintain a weighty presence of its troops in Germany and in Europe as a whole." The question is why.

In principle, the French newspaper CROIX responds to this question: "For the United States, concerned about ensuring its leading role in a 'new world order,' security in Europe is envisaged only within the framework of NATO," i.e., the structure in which the leading roles firmly belong to America itself and its closest allies, Great Britain and the FRG. By maintaining "a weighty presence" of troops in Europe, the United States continues to retain the leadership in the military-political union of Western countries as well.

Apparently, the reason for the reluctance of the White House to reduce the American military presence in the Asian Pacific Region is the same. As the ASSOCIATED PRESS estimates, in reality "no dramatic reductions are expected," despite the fact that they intend to reduce the strength of the group of U.S. troops there by approximately 10 percent by cosmetic measures.

Perhaps, there are no grounds to do this? Not so. A report by the National Defense Directorate of Japan, a U.S. ally, indicates: President Gorbachev stated that by the middle of 1991 the group of Soviet troops in the Far East will be reduced by 12 ground force divisions and 12 Air Force regiments; 16 vessels of the Pacific Fleet will be taken out of the combat inventory. All of this is in keeping with reality, notes the report. However, a quite unexpected conclusion is drawn: "The fundamental attitude towards the Soviet Armed Forces has not changed," because on the whole, in quite a number of areas, "specific modernization of the troops" is carried out.

The positions of those who would be glad to see the Soviet Union weakened, not only economically but also militarily, are still strong in the West. Here is the position of the right-wing circles of another close partner of the United States, Great Britain, outlined in an editorial in the newspaper SUN: Not to help Moscow by means of funds and other resources until Moscow begins to reduce its military potential.

By all signs, in Washington as well, they are leaning toward such views. Economic assistance is being tied to political changes in the USSR and to our concessions at negotiations on both strategic and conventional weapons. Meanwhile, M. Fitzwater, press secretary of the White House, publicly acknowledged that the United States "is not prepared to signal flexibility" at these negotiations. Why this hard military and foreign-policy line? Apparently, due to the same principles of the arrangement of the world American style.

However, I will repeat again that even America cannot shoulder the burden of constantly beefing up its military muscles anymore. Up to $300 billion is spent in the United States for military purposes annually. In the

opinion of a commentator of the newspaper NEWSDAY, R. Reno, $30 billion annually is enough to ensure stability. These funds marshaled as assistance to economic reforms in the USSR could help to save hundreds of billions: One does not fight his friends; one prepares to fight enemies, even potential enemies. This is why a guarantee of stable peace is found precisely in the friendship and cooperation of our countries, which have truly great potentials. In turn, striving to create a single-pole world can only generate corresponding opposition.

As far as importing the nonmelting chocolate from the United States is concerned, even if developed for military purposes, I believe no country of the world, including ours, would refuse to do this...

### Volunteer Groups Formed for Transcaucasus Service

*PM0506100191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1*

[From roundup of PRAVDA, TASS, INTERFAX, and AZIYA-PRESS reports under the "News for the Issue" rubric: "Teams of Volunteer Draftees"]

[Text] Teams of volunteer draftees are being made up in Leningrad for service in the Transcaucasus. Leningrad City Military Commissariat has declared that a team of draftees is being made up of volunteers who have stated a desire to serve in the border regions of Armenia and Azerbaijan. According to a claim by a spokesman for the city military commissariat, the pay of these draftees is raised several times over and leave during service is increased.

### Exercise in Repulsing SLCM Attack Described

*PM2205141391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 91 First Edition p 2*

[Correspondent Captain Second Rank M. Lukanin report under the "From Scene of Event" rubric: "Missile Screen"]

[Text] These tactical exercises are certainly destined to go down in the modern history of the Air Defense Forces. From the coast, where antiaircraft missile subunits are permanently stationed, a screen was erected against a massive strike being inflicted at low altitudes by sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM]. The Air Defense Force subunits were deliberately placed under extremely complex conditions.

There was a short burst of flame, and a thick trail of smoke hung over the ocean, curving sharply, and stayed there long after the missile had disappeared from view. An instant later an identical swirling peak rose above the nearby cape. One more fiery dash flashed aloft...

Specialists would evaluate the innovation: The training positions of some launchers were located considerably above the targets' flight trajectory. That is, it was necessary to fire against them from adverse angles. Not to mention the fact that the targets were being launched from submarines. The surface of the water created a natural background for cruise missiles, and active use was made of radioelectronic cover and other means to reduce the targets' vulnerability to a minimum.

Most people usually associate the ocean with some infinite magnitude separating the forces of the opposing sides by thousands of kilometers. On the one hand this is so, but take this fact, if you please: The target missiles launched secretively from the depths of the ocean spent such a short time in the impact zone that it would not have been long enough to take one or two drags on a cigarette.

Seconds,... kilometers,... approach time,... angle of attack. However, you get an unusual feeling, knowing that a mighty package of destructive energy is now heading right for the shore where you are standing. Not just a speck—a blip on a radar screen—but a fast-moving target missile specially programmed to break through defenses. Range 80, 70, 60...

It was noticeable that these figures overshadowed all other thoughts of the firing participants, but this was probably, rather, out of habit. After the missiles have left the launchers, guided rapidly toward each other on countercourses, it only remains for people to await the result. They have already done all they could: Colonel A. Shchukin in the command center of the antiaircraft missile unit; Lieutenant Colonels S. Spitsyn, Ye. Kiriyevskiy, A. Belousov, and S. Vetrov in the battalions' training positions; Captain I. Lyamin and Senior Lieutenants S. Ruvimov and A. Matveyev, guidance, interception, and launch officers; and Junior Sergeant D. Garkavenko and Private V. Stukalin, manual tracking operators.

Today you frequently hear it said of people in uniform that it is too costly for our impoverished state to maintain them and that they take an inordinately great deal of the "overall pie." Having seen lots of pictures of the war in the Persian Gulf, some of our fellow citizens suddenly started grieving and lamenting: How far we are behind the level of the U.S. professionals with their Patriot miracle complexes and other high-tech weapons.

But here's a curious thing: U.S. military specialists themselves do not seem to think this and are not seduced by easy victories over Scuds. Otherwise why would they have sent several Orion reconnaissance aircraft at once to the region of these exercises, some of which were so eager that it was necessary to call up our aircraft? However, this time we did not particularly hide from them but merely observed precautionary measures. See how the S-300 Soviet mobile antiaircraft missile complex works, to use the language of professional missilemen, against cruise missiles (and there is certainly no comparing these with Scuds).

"Detonation, detonation, detonation...." reports followed after each launch. They struck assuredly from the

shore, creating such density of fire that individual anti-aircraft missiles had to respond to fragments of targets knocked out just a moment before.

But combat readiness means not only high technology and highly accurate weapons. Later, when the feverish activity had died down, the umpires had left, and the battalions had returned to their duty positions, Col. Shchukin unexpectedly let drop in conversation that this was his third year of service in these places and he had not managed to get away on leave once in this time. Rearmament was taking place, and it was "impossible" to do otherwise. He had laid down this "impossible" for himself, and it was useless to inquire how he, like other officers in the Air Defense Forces with whom I have met in these districts, endure the nomadic life moving from garrison to garrison and the eternal disorder of daily life or, to be more accurate, in recent years—of an existence in which people in society have begun to look on a person in military uniform as a cowed pawn.

"Take note," Shchukin said, taking me over to a plotting board of the air situation in the command center's battle management room. "Here there is an Orion in our zone, and another one is approaching. And this is now a permanent regime, so to speak, even after the exercises. At the same time reconnaissance activity in the air is increasing year by year and has clear trends and law-governed patterns: They are there as soon as some new anti-Army campaign is mounted in our country. They are sounding out the extent to which they might have succeeded in demoralizing us from within. In vain. We know how to control our emotions..."

It so happened, by way of a coincidence, that during the very days and hours when the antiaircraft missile battalions were dispersing on the ocean shore following a march, when submarines designated "enemy" were diving deep into the waters and setting an attack course, when the sky was becoming crowded with aircraft loosening the ground defenses in wave after wave before the main strike, and when, finally, a missile duel began to rumble on the limits of engagement—at precisely this very time the city for the sake of whose reliable defense all this was being done was tiring itself out with almost carnival gaiety to celebrate the arrival there of a large delegation representing the business world of Alaska. "For the first time... We are so happy,..." reporters for the local independent television company choked with emotion, urgently reporting over the air almost around the clock, as the biggest news item, where the foreigners had gone, what they had said, and what they thought about us. The succession of banquets, parties, and other receptions, for which the local authority had forked out with unprecedented generosity, was invariably accompanied by spirited refrains on our part: "Bathhouse, vodka, pancakes, and salmon." Points of contact have been found, they said. How splendid, how OK everything is, "don't play the fool, America!"

The Americans smiled politely. They were well aware who was playing the fool and who was not. In their country just as in ours.

## Baltic Republics

### Deputy Views Baltic Situation, Western Support

*LD0406123291 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 0900 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Interview with Mikk Titma, member of the Supreme Soviet and "well-known political analyst," by correspondent Raul Malk from the Supreme Soviet building in Tallinn—live]

[Text] [Malk] This sharpness of temper and the anxious moments within the past few weeks, in Lithuania first and foremost, are they anything serious, or is it a case of only testing one's strength? Or is this the case of a situation of all men no longer subordinated to Moscow? How is one to assess the present situation?

[Titma] It seems that quite serious regroupings of political forces have taken place in Moscow. If in January Gorbachev was indisputably standing behind the action in the Baltics, then the Nine plus One agreement which is known to us changed the whole perestroyka situation. I would call this now post-perestroyka. Gorbachev was forced to acknowledge that the democratic forces behind Yeltsin form one side in a political dialogue, and he entered into a dialogue with them. Furthermore, seeing that he cannot introduce order in the country, so to speak, in conjunction with the conservative forces and begin to govern in the old manner, he decided to give up joining those forces, made another turn, and turned to a dialogue with the Yeltsin group, together with his allies.

This, however, made his former partners considerably more extremist. The thing is that it is indeed a very big force: the conservative sections within the party, the army, the KGB, and also the military industry. One can say that those people are now disappointed in Gorbachev. They will no longer cooperate with Gorbachev, that is clear, even though they are willing to cooperate with Yeltsin and view him as a much more reliable partner. Once something has been agreed upon, that is what gets done. Gorbachev has on several occasions abandoned his previous agreements and changed sides.

In this situation it seems to me that at present the forces acting in the Baltics quite evidently are not working together with Gorbachev because Gorbachev is applying for a loan—in very degrading conditions—in essence he asked to take part in the meeting of the seven and he was met halfway. But all this demands clear-cut behavior in the Baltics, with strict observance of international law. Furthermore, I have information to the effect tha the West has begun to support us actively and to demand independence for the Baltics. This is the West's position, and this is a principled breakthrough.

In this situation one can presuppose that the conservative force which indubitably is considerably more eager to act in Lithuania because the Lithuanian leadership behaves rather provocatively, let us say, and for this reason all this reminds us, as is said about the war, of trial battles and continuous testing of nerves, so to speak. I do not imagine that this is a signal for any other, kind of great-power action in respect of the Baltics. It is simply activity of the third, the conservative, force at a local level.

We do not need to overdramatize this aspect because the resolution in principle in our support—so that we could become independent—exists also in Russia. In the circles of Russian politicians an understanding has now been reached that the Baltics are indeed a special case, and basically there is support for our independence endeavors.

[Malk] Thank you, Mikk Titma.

### Latvian Leader Warns of Possible July Coup

*LD0506170291 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga June 5 TASS—The Soviet and Latvian delegations plan to meet tomorrow to discuss political, social and economic questions. It was planned to be held late in May but was postponed at the request of the Soviet Union's side.

Head of the Latvian delegaton Ilmar Biser, deputy prime minister of the republic, said in an interview with the DIENA newspaper today that a "state coup is possible in July".

In his opinion "the All-Latvian Salvation Committee" has not stopped its activities and is drafting plans to return communists to power" and to set up a government which will sign a Union treaty.

The deputy prime minister believes that, therefore, Latvians dispay a lukewarm attitude to the talks both with the Baltic Military District and with the Soviet leadership.

As for the economic side of relations between the republic and the centre, they are more realistic. The press service of the Latvian Finance Ministry told the DIENA newspaper that Latvia undertakes this year to transfer to the USSR budget 350 million roubles provided for the implementation of all-Union programmes.

It is planned to transfer additionally to the centre funds received from the re-assessement of goods and material values at enterprises subordinated to the centre, as well as 20 per cent of their depriciation deductions.

This money (66 million roubles) will go to the all-Union fund for economic stabilisation.

Last week parliament rejected the government's proposal on such changes in the republican budget. But, knowing the insistence of Prime Minister Godmanis, it is safe to say that he will again submit this question to the republican parliament over the next few days.

### Regional Procuracy Staff Assails RSFSR Move

*LD0506201991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1826 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[By correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga, 5 June (TASS)—Violations of the requirements of the USSR Constitution and paying no heed to the legal foundations of society and the rights of Soviet citizens are at the basis of recent conflicts and clashes in the Baltic republics, says a joint statement made by employees of the procuracies of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was published here today.

In the joint statement of the USSR president and leaders of the nine republics, it was noted that an undisputable condition for the stability of the situation in the country is the adoption of resolute measures to restore constitutional order everywhere and the strict observance of existing USSR laws. "In this connection", notes the procuracies' statement, "the actions of the present leadership of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] procuracy, which on 23 May signed a protocol on establishing cooperation with the unlawfully formed procuracy of the Latvian republic, cause bewilderment." This decision by the leadership of the procuracy of the Russian Federation, in the view of the authors of the statement, merely "helps to reinforce the separatist aspirations of the present leadership in Latvia." The document stresses: "Such actions on the part of the leadership of the RSFSR procuracy do not facilitate a strengthening of socialist legality in the country; they lead to a split in the unified procuracy system; they disorganize the work of law enforcement bodies; and they hinder the implementation of supervision of the execution of laws on the territory of other republics."

### Latvian Faction Sends Message to Gorbachev

*OW0606044591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] The Ravnopravie faction of the Latvian parliament has sent a message to the USSR Supreme Soviet and President Gorbachev dealing with the attacks on the customs checkpoints of Latvia on the night of May 24.

The faction accounts [word as received] the incidents to the formation of the Latvian customs department which is illegal from the viewpoint of Union legislation. According to the Soviet customs code approved on March 26, 1991, the Union government is in charge of the customs policy throughout the country. The absence of a legal act of the Latvian Republic on customs makes the existence of the customs department illegal also from the viewpoint of Latvian Jurisidiction.

The message says that all charges brought against the Riga black berets in the note of the Latvian parliament are groundless.

### Latvian Parliament Passes New "Police Law"

*OW0606022791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] This Tuesday Latvian Parliament passed "Police Law".

This Law comes into power 6 days after the official publication. Minister of Inner Affairs of Latvia has been entrusted with the reorganisation of the Militia before the first of June 1992.

The Law has an innovation connected with the implementation of the social guarantees of the policemen, which Latvian militia servicemen have had never before. At the same time, these are some new orders. For example, the Latvian policeman, according to the new law, should have at last minimal knowledges of the state (Latvian) language.

While entering a new job the former Latvian militia servicemen would be rested the same ranks and the guarantees, connected with them. During several months Latvian Government has to prepare new titles and ranks for the policemen.

After a little discussion the deputies agreed that before the first of December 1991 the new order of material and technical provision, both the basic wages and the earnings for the ranks have to be confirmed, a new resolution about the Police Department of Latvia should be adopted and the Chief of the Department has to be appointed.

### Latvian Paper on Investigation of OMON Actions

*OW0506094891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] The independent Latvian newspaper DIENA reports that the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs investigating the attacks which the special militia units (OMON or Black Berets) made on the customs posts in Latvia and Lithuania have not drawn any conclusions yet. V. Zyurikov, an investigator for Lativa, told DIENA that the conclusions would be made by the Ministry's leaders (OMON is subordinated to the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs—BF [BALTFAX]) after the group of investigators for Latvia and Lithuania presented their reports in Moscow. The Moscow guests said that the Latvian authorities did not interfere with their work.

In its turn, the Communist Party newspaper, SOVETSKAYA LITVA, published the Latvian Procurator's Office's appeal on June 4. According to earlier reports, after Latvia adopted the declaration on the restoration of independence, the Procurator's Office of the republic split into two departments, the Procurator's Office of the Latvian republic under Latvia's jurisdiction and the Procurator's Office of the Latvian Republic under the jurisdiction of the USSR. The appeal urges all the citizens who were detained at Latvia's customs posts

and who had anything confiscated and yet unreturned to inform the Procurator's Office about that.

### RSFSR Prosecutor's Office Latvian Accord Deplored

*PM0506144191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 91 First Edition p 2*

["Joint Statement by Staffers at the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Lithuanian SSR Prosecutor's Offices"]

[Text] Recent events in the Baltic republics are the cause of great alarm among the country's inhabitants.

At the base of the conflicts and clashes which have occurred lie gross violations of the requirements of the USSR Constitution and a total disregard for the legal foundations of society and the rights of Soviet citizens.

Despite decisions by the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet, legislative acts infringing citizens' rights and contradicting universally recognized norms of international law continue to be adopted in our republics.

Our republic supreme soviets have made efforts to abolish the Latvian and Lithuanian Prosecutor's Offices—operating legally at present—and place the system of republic law enforcement organs under direct command in order to achieve their political ambitions.

To this end, the Lithuanian and Latvian Supreme Soviets, in spite of Article 168 of the USSR Constitution and Article 7 of the USSR Law "On the USSR Prosecutor's Office," set up corresponding prosecutor's offices in 1990 which do not form part of the single Union system and take no heed of USSR laws in their activity.

The USSR president and the leaders of the highest state organs of the nine Union republics, after discussing the country's situation at their 21 April 1991 meeting, adopted a joint statement "On Urgent Measures To Stabilize the Situation in the Country and Overcome the Crisis." The participants in the meeting, which was attended by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin, who also signed this statement, noted that the essential condition for stabilizing the situation in the country is the adoption of resolute measures to restore constitutional order everywhere and ensure unswerving compliance with current USSR laws until the new Union treaty and a new USSR Constitution are adopted.

In this connection perplexity is caused by the actions of the present RSFSR Prosecutor's Office leadership, which signed a protocol 23 May 1991 with the illegally formed "Latvian Republic Prosecutor's Office" on establishing cooperation. Such conduct on the part of the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office leadership furthers the realization of the current Latvian leadership's separatist aspirations.

With this in mind, the staffers at the Latvian and Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor's Offices consider it necessary to announce:

Such acts on the part of the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office leadership do not help strengthen socialist legitimacy in the country, knowingly lead to a split in the single prosecutor's system, disrupt the work of law enforcement organs, and obstruct supervision of the implementation of laws on other republic territories.

We propose to the USSR and Union republic Supreme Soviets, deputies, the public, and law enforcement organ officials that the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office leadership be asked to halt its divisive activity, and we ask the USSR general prosecutor within the bounds of his competence to evaluate such actions by the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office under his jurisdiction in the appropriate manner.

Adopted at a general meeting of staffers from the Lithuanian SSR Prosecutors Office, 30 May 1991

Adopted at a general meeting of staffers from the Latvian SSR Prosecutors Office, 31 May 1991

### Residents 'To Take Up Duty' Outside Parliament

*LD0506135891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Western press notes the strange coincidence between the latest tension in the Baltic republics and Mikhail Gorbachev's trip to Oslo and Stockholm. As we have already reported, many military patrols appeared in Vilnius, and Vytautas Landsbergis appealed to citizens to gather at the parliament building to defend lawful power. A meeting of the provisional defense leadership of the republic was held. Today, Sajudis announced a schedule for people to take up duty outside the parliament. The military has stated that the parliament's panic was unnecessary. The Vilnius garrison was carrying out training for searching for deserters.

### Vilnius Commander Rejects Landsbergis Accusations

*LD0506191391 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Report by TASS correspondent Mikhail Zakharchuk]

[Text] Vilnius June 5 TASS—Major General Vladimir Uskhopchik, commandant of Vilnius Garrison, has refuted speculation voiced by Lithuanian Parliament Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis during his television appearance that soldiers could make an attempt to seize the parliament and other administrative buildings.

"Like all pronouncements by Landsbergis, this one rests on a tendentious estimate of developments," Uskhopchik said.

"There was almost no joint patrolling, announced by an order issued by the USSR minister of defence and by the USSR minister of the interior, in downtown Vilnius recently," he told TASS.

"However, the order has not been cancelled. In line with it, we carried out joint patrolling on June 3. The patrolling involved 40 groups, each consisting of one officer and three soldiers."

"The servicemen had personal weapons without ammunition. One wheeled vehicle with communications facilities was assigned for every three patrol groups. Not a single armoured personnel carrier or a tank was present in the city. Patrolling began at 21.00 on June 3 and ended at night at 01.00."

"Patrolmen were assigned the task of maintaining the public order in the city, detaining deserters and identifying draft-dodgers," the general emphasised.

"The patrolling resulted in the detention of seven deserters. The talk that 150 practically unarmed patrolmen went into the streets in order to seize the parliament and other administrative buildings are not serious, to put it mildly."

"Besides, Landsbergis is playing cunning. Almost a week prior to the patrolling, General of the Army Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, notified the Lithuanian Parliament chairman that the USSR Defence Ministry reserves the right to take all measures to ensure absolute compliance with the USSR cabinet's resolution on a regular draft for active military duty," the garrison commandant said.

The situation in Vilnius is normal now, according to Uskhopchik.

"No effect, counted upon by those who expected unrest in the city and those who raised clamour over the joint patrolling, was achieved," Uskhopchik said.

### Officers Defend 3 Jun Vilnius Actions

*LD0506201391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jan 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] We have in our studio two representatives from the USSR Armed Forces and the Soviet militia. These are Major General Viktor Alekseyevich Avdeyev, spokesman for the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and militia Major General Eduard Vasilyevich Kalachev. Let us now talk about events in Lithuania. Controversial reports about patrolling of Vilnius by the military are coming from there. I am asking General Avdeyev to clarify this question. Well, please.

[Avdeyev] Patrolling in Vilnius, as in any other city in the country, is being carried out by the military units of the USSR Ministry of Defense in order to insure discipline among the servicemen and, in special cases, for catching deserters. After the January events the number of patrols in the capital of Lithuania was reduced. The patrolling in the center of the city was temporarily suspended. At present, the number of servicemen in the process of being discharged from the ranks of the armed forces has increased, the draft into the army is under way, and the recruits' departure is going on.

The district officers' mess, the military registration and enlistment office, and the ticket offices for military personnel are all situated in the city center. Moreover, the attacks on servicemen have become more frequent, and verbal abuse is common. On 3 June, by the decision of the garrison commander, such patrolling was resumed in the center of the city. At the same time the number of patrols in the railway station, the bus station, and the airport was increased. This is what I have to say on the matter.

[Announcer] I would like to ask if such actions of the garrison commander are constitutional.

[Avdeyev] Such actions by the garrison commander are constitutional and are in accordance with the code of the USSR internal service.

[Announcer] There are also reports that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops, in particular, the OMON [special purpose militia detachment] have also been involved in the latest events in Vilnius. I am addressing this question to militia Major General Kalachev, head of the main directorate for the maintenance of public order: What could you say in connection with this?

[Kalachev] I would like to say that this is completely untrue. I should like to say that not a single subunit of the Internal Troops, nor the OMON personnel took part in these actions on 3 June.

[Announcer] Well, I would like to thank you for the explanations and for taking part in our program.

### Landsbergis: Citizens 'Not Obliged' To Join Army

*PM0406112991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 First Edition p 1*

[Item from "Today's News" column of PRAVDA, TASS, and INTERFAX reports: "Serving in a 'Foreign Army'"]

[Text] In connection with the draft into the country's Armed Forces, V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has stated that the republic's citizens are not obliged to serve in a "foreign army." He described the demands to observe the USSR Constitution and the procedure for the draft into the Soviet Army as an ultimatum and a press-gang [razboy]. The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet Information Bureau has circulated a report in this regard which essentially contains a refusal to organize the draft into the country's Armed Forces.

### Lithuanian Leader Warns of Military Action

*OW0506134191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1800 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] The Lithuanian parliament's information bureau has made public a commentary by Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis on the events that took place yesterday evening and night in Vilnius.

On June 3, numerous military points checking documents were established in the Lithuanian capital.

As V. Landsbergis put it: "Certain signs show that the current time is most favourable for a new attack against the Lithuanian Republic... Gorbachev leaves for Norway, Yeltsin is busy with election campaign". Concerning the report by the USSR Prosecutor General Nikolay Trubin on the tragic January events in Vilnius, V. Landsbergis said it "directly encourages the military" to take new actions.

"It would be the last attempt to change the course of developments in Lithuania before the signing of a new Union treaty, a meeting of the G-7 countries in London, and a positive resolution of the Lithuania's independence problem which is inevitably coming up", V. Landsbergis pointed out.

On Tuesday, at a briefing in the Lithuanian parliament, it was announced that because of yesterday's events Vytautas Landsbergis delayed his trip to Poland where he was scheduled to meet with Pope Joh Paul II.

### Lithuanian Economic Minister Interviewed

*PM0506123991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 22 May 91 pp 1, 4*

[Interview with Vytautas Navickas, Lithuanian minister of economics, by A. Gasyunene; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "V. Navickas: 'We Need Each Other....'"]

[Text] Close public attention is now riveted on the republic's economy, since our living standard is declining menacingly despite the government's efforts to compensate the population for part of its losses. EKHO LITVY No. 86 published a talk with A. Brazauskas on the results of the republic's economic development for the first quarter of this year. We asked Vytautas Navickas, minister of economics, to say whether a breakthrough in economic activity has been outlined in the past six weeks and to describe the measures which are being taken to eliminate crisis phenomena.

[Gasyunene] In your view, what trends are manifest today in the results of economic activity?

[Navickas] The results of economic activity in the production sphere are of course not gratifying. The production slump has occurred in all sectors and the population's living standard has declined. These are the inevitable consequences of the overall crisis in the USSR, into whose economy we are integrated, and also of our own difficulties connected with the transition to a market economy. The transitional period is in itself complex. Primarily because economic reform is being implemented at the same time as political reform and it is not through our will that the potential for maintaining normal interstate economic relations is so far absent.

Now everything has started moving and we must wait for results, advancing one step at a time in the field of the normalization of interstate relations, privatization, and the pursuit of prices and tax policy, releasing enterprises and farms from petty administrative tutelage. We hope that in the very near future this package of measures will produce a return.

[Gasyunene] What else is the ministry planning to overcome crisis phenomena? What is the strategy and tactic of its activity and its close and distant aims?

[Navickas] Its closest aim is the implementation of a package of measures connected with the initial period of the transition to the market economy in order on the one hand to halt the decline in the living standard in Lithuania and on the other to encourage the transition to the market with minimal expense. Here much depends on the balance between incomes (with a consideration for their social differentiation) and market prices and on the adaptation of the laws which have been adopted under specific conditions. That means that we must constantly analyze the way they are working, seek ways for their effective application, and when necessary make amendments.

Tactics and strategy have become particularly closely interwoven in the practice of Lithuania's relations with the USSR and the Union republics, which undoubtedly exert powerful influence on the course of our affairs. Now, for instance, we have elaborated a program for the functioning of the republic's economy under extreme conditions. A regime of stringent saving and accumulation of raw material and resources has been taken as its basis. All this should ultimately take shape as the republic's independent economy.

[Gasyunene] You took part in the recent Tallinn meeting of representatives of several republics. What impressed you most and what were its results for Lithuania?

[Navickas] This was the fifth meeting, so that it is a case of an integral process which has been dubbed the Tallinn process. My main impression is that we met as equal partners. Each republic has its own political interests and aspirations. But they are all brought closer by the desire to seek nonstandard ways of overcoming the crisis and civilized forms of the transition to the market economy. With every meeting the circle of these likeminded people is increasingly wider and their mutual understanding and dialogue deeper.

Representatives of seven foreign firms took part in this meeting together with representatives of Lithuania,

Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. A series of documents was elaborated, of which I consider the main one to be "Basic Principles of Organizing Commodity Exchange in 1992."

Thus a voluntary mutual commitment between republics and regions is gradually taking over from pressure from the center and centralized distribution is being replaced by trade. Note that it is the republics which have proclaimed state sovereignty which have become the initiators of this process. For instance, an association of commodity producers has been created in the Ukraine. We have joined it, signing the relevant documents and commitments for 1992. There is an agreement on the coordination of prices policy, customs procedure, and so forth. I think that bilateral and multilateral state agreements will open the way for the creation of joint ventures, associations, and concerns not on instructions from above but out of the actual need for cooperation. So that the Tallinn process is essentially the path toward the creation of a single economic space. That is the main result of these meetings both for Lithuania and for the other republics.

[Gasyunene] That is one aspect of the process. It is gratifying that it is optimistic. But the other is relations with the center. How do you maintain contact with V. Pavlov's cabinet?

[Navickas] There are ties, although we do not take part in the USSR agreements. Business and pragmatic interests prompt us to visit Moscow. For instance, specialists from the ministry took part as observers in the discussion of the Union Cabinet of Ministers anticrisis program and even now are continuing to work on improving it. We are preparing the relevant measures with a consideration for the new economic relations taking shape in the Union republics.

[Gasyunene] USSR Vice Premier V. Shcherbakov put it extremely clearly in one interview: If you want to live separately, then do so, but know what this costs. On the other hand, in the opinion of Estonian Premier E. Savisaar, the consequences of tough sanctions of this kind are grave for the economy but nonetheless not as destructive as predicted. What do you think about that?

[Navickas] Yes, serious debate has long been under way on these questions. Nothing is a surprise to us here: The transition to world prices, accounting in freely convertible currency. It is clear that a new stage lies ahead in the development of our economic relations with the USSR. We must seek to preserve mutually advantageous ties with the Union and its republics. And at the same time seek partners in the West and develop international trade. The best option today is to conclude an economic treaty with the Soviet Union. We already have trade agreements with several republics which intend to sign the Union treaty. We shall continue to work by proceeding from the need for mutually advantageous cooperation. We need each other. That is the reality.

## Pope Meets Poland's Lithuanian Community

*LD0506171491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1040 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] Warsaw, 5 June (TASS)—Correspondent Valentin Volkov; continuing his pastoral visit around Poland, Pope John Paul II met today in the town of Lomza with representatives of the Lithuanian community in Poland and with 15,000 pilgrims who had come from Lithuania. At mass in the cathedral of St. Michael Angelo, members of Poland's and Lithuania's episcopate and Kazimiera Prunskiene, former prime minister of Lithuania, were also present. Part of the mass was said in the Lithuanian language.

Juliusz Paetz, the bishop of Lomza, welcoming John Paul II, thanked him for his constant concern for the Lithuanian people. He expressed the wish that the Lithuanians of that diocese, which borders on Lithuania, may be a bridge between the peoples of Poland and Lithuania, a core of fraternity and goodneighborly cooperation between them, and a sign of a new era of reconciliation and peace. Cardinal Vincentas Sladkevicius, head of Lithuania's Catholic Church, also spoke.

In his address to those assembled, the Pope talked about the Christian faith, which over many centuries has established deep roots in Lithuania and deeply penetrated into the souls of the people, becoming an inspiration for customs, spirituality, culture and civilization in that Baltic bastion of the Catholic Church. He expressed hopes for future harmonious and fruitful co-existence and cooperation in all spheres of national life, but always with respect for universally recognized principles of international order, which wil insure durable peace in that part of Europe. The Lomza meeting with Lithuanians, noted John Paul II, brings nearer the day when a pastoral visit by the Pope will take place to Lithuania.

At the episcopal palace the Pope met a delegation of the Lithuanian leadership which included Celovas-Vytautas Stankevivius, deputy chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet; Zigmas Vaisvila, deputy head of the government; and Darius Kuolys, minister of culture and education. As reported to journalists by members of the Lithuanian delegation, John Paul II told them that he understands Lithuania's problems and its striving for freedom. Lithuania, like every state, has a right to freedom, he noted, describing the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact as a historic injustice. The Pope said that he is holding conversations with Moscow about the hopes of the Lithuanian people. The members of the delegation confirmed the invitation to John Paul II to pay a visit to Lithuania.

## RSFSR

### TASS Reviews 5 Jun Activities of RSFSR Candidates

*LD0506214791 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Russian Parliament Chairman Boris Yeltsin today completed a tour of Chelyabinsk region, an important industrial area of the country.

Over there, in one of zones of ecological disaster, brought about by years-long operation of the production amalgamation Mayak, the first of Soviet nuclear industry, Yeltsin pointed out the need to establish a national ecological security system. He announced that a comprehensive programme for aid to the region would be adopted soon.

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, presidential candidate from the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union, today met with people in Chelyabinsk.

Aman Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Regional Council, today met with members of the general public in Leningrad. He devoted the bulk of his speech to his election programme which is aimed at taking care of low-incomed sections of the population, at fighting crime and profiteering.

Tuleyev said that it is important for the republic to get rid of the diktat of the centre and to change the system of taxation, and supported the idea of establishing a free enterprise zone in Leningrad region.

General Albert Makashov, commander of the Volga-Ural Military District, today met with people in Moscow while former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov appeared on central television.

Sociolological services take opinion polls among the population about the most likely candidate for the Russian presidency.

According to the independent sociological service Mneniye (Opinion), Muscovites will give preference to Boris Yeltsin (59.1 percent of the electorate are expected to vote for him) and seven per cent will cast votes for Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The Russian Socio-political Institute adheres to a different view. According to its data, a tendency towards decline in Yeltsin's rating appeared at the beginning of June (from 60 per cent at the beginning of may to 44 early in June). At the same time the popularity of Ryzhkov rose from 23 to 31 per cent.

The Krasnodar sociological research centre believes that Yeltsin and Ryzhkov have equal chances to win.

### Yeltsin 'Instructions' on N. Ossetia, N. Caucasus

*LD0506224291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1830 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] We have received the text of an instruction of the chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet on measures to strengthen law and order in areas of North Ossetia and Checheno-Ingushetia. The document instructs all organs of power and administration in the republic to adopt urgent measures regarding the rigorous implementation of the RSFSR law on the rehabilitation of the repressed peoples and the decision of the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies on the matter in strict accordance with the main principles of the Russian Constitution.

TASS has also published an appeal by the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to the peoples of the north Caucasus. It notes that the law on the rehabilitation of the repressed peoples has condemned, for the first time during the years of Soviet rule, acts of genocide and state terrorism within the country. However, the implementation of the law in individual regions has proceeded in an unconstitutional manner. Some representatives of the repressed peoples have begun to seize the land without authorization and to squeeze out other repressed peoples from the areas of their traditional residence. The way out of the economic, political, and social crisis, the appeal says, lies not in enmity but in peace and civic concord, and in strict observance of the laws.

### Yeltsin Tours Polluted Region Near Chelyabinsk

*LD0506190991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, is continuing his working tour of Russia. Today he visited the districts of Chelyabinsk Oblast which are most dangerous from the ecological point of view. On the banks of River Techa, which is polluted by radioactive waste, he chatted to residents of the village of Muslyumovo. Next, Yeltsin visited the Mayak chemical combine and went to (Lake Karachay). The radionuclides contained in the lake are estimated at 120 million curies, which is significantly higher than the total emission from the Chernobyl nuclear power station. During a visit to the site where radioactive waste is stored, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and the persons accompanying him received a fairly high dose of radiation, which was, however, not dangerous to their health. The meetings with the managers of the Mayak association and the conversations with scientists and local residents are necessary to investigate problems on the spot and to discuss possible ways of solving them.

A short piece of information: According to the Chelyabinsk Soviet, radioactive pollution of a region in which almost 500,000 people live occurred as a result of accidents and critical situations at the Mayak combine in the late 1940's and in the 1950's and 1960's. Of those

people, 18,000 have been resettled, and about 1,000 are suffering from radiation sickness.

It is expected that the chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet will arrive in Moscow this evening. Then, he will continue his working tour of the Urals region. As we have already reported, it is due to finish in Sverdlovsk, where a document establishing an economic interaction association for a number of oblasts in the Urals will be signed.

### Yeltsin Orders Improved Law Enforcement

*OW0606051991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] The head of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Boris Yeltsin, has endorsed a decree "On Measures to Strengthen Law and Order in North Ossetia and Chechen-Ingushetia."

The RSFSR Procurator General is expected, within the next 30 days, to investigate the facts of violence in a number of North Ossetian and Chechen-Ingush districts, including in the village of Tritskaya, where armed clashes between Cossacks and Ingushes in late April resulted in causalties.

The RSFSR government was instructed to work out, also within a month's time, recommendations on a compensation for the material losses incurred by the victims and on ways of returning refugees to their homes.

A parliamentary commission will be set up to conduct a parallel investigation and report its findings before June 10, by which time a commission should have been formed to look into the problems facing Russia's Cossacks. It will involve representatives of the national Cossacks' Union.

Mr. Yeltsin also signed an appeal to people in the Northern Caucasus, stressing the need to settle territorial disputes in compliance with the law "On the Exoneration of the Repressed People."

### Yeltsin Concessions on RSFSR KGB Assessed

*PM0506103191 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 20, 19 May 91 (Signed to Press 14 May) p 10*

[Article by observer Yevgeniya Albats: "RSFSR KGB Exists. What Next?"]

[Text] The protocol on establishing a Russian KGB, signed last week by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman B. Yeltsin and USSR KGB Chairman V. Kryuchkov, is regarded by many observers as a compromise that is yet another consequence of the Nine plus One statement.

The point is that in the original version of the protocol, the status of the new committee—and this is the fundamental question—was defined as republican. This is, in juridical terms it must be subordinated to Russian power structures—the RSFSR Presidium and Council of Ministers. However, as a result of the 40-minute tete-a-tete between Yeltsin and Kryuchkov, a major amendment was made to the protocol: The future Russian KGB was described as a Union-republican committee, which means that it is subject to dual jurisdiction. However, speculation about whether it will be subordinated more to the Union or to the republic is obviously meaningless: General Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, stated that the Russian KGB will be rigidly within the structure of the Union department.

It is true that the preamble to the protocol, according to B. Bolshakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Security Committee, enshrines respect for the declaration on the republic's sovereignty. It is true that Vladimir Kryuchkov has sugared the pill somewhat by saying that the status of the Russian committee will be special from all points of view (staff, budget, rights, and so forth). It is true that he explained the amendment to the protocol as necessary "at the present stage" and important for the signing of the Union Treaty. However, the answer to the question of what arguments Kryuchkov nevertheless found (and not just Kryuchkov, presumably) to convince Yeltsin to make such a concession are as obscure as before. But the fact remains: Russia's "eyes and ears" will evidently not just be its own "eyes and ears."

A second important point confirmed by the protocol concerns the cadre issue. For the moment USSR KGB Major General Viktor Ivanenko has been confirmed as acting chairman of the Russian KGB. According to Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Security Committee, Ivanenko's political views can be defined as centrist, which is quite good. Another important point is that Ivanenko's candidacy (for the post of first deputy chairman, it is true) was chosen by the Russian side and did not provoke disagreement from the center.

What next? According to Bolshakov, the most difficult thing begins next: The demarcation of functions and powers between the center and the republic. At present, according to Bolshakov, the protocol states merely that the USSR KGB determines the basic principles of intelligence and counterintelligence activity. It is also known that oblast administrations located on Russian territory (except Moscow, whose future is currently under discussion) will be transferred to the republic committee's control, and a central apparatus with a staff numbering some 300-350 people will be set up.

However, I do not think that the process of demarcating powers will proceed with complete mutual understanding. Partly because at present the creation of the new committee is based on a fundamentally different theoretical concept—protecting the security not of the state but primarily of the individual and society, and only then of the state.

Finally, there is the budget of the new committee. This year it will be funded by the center, and it is not impossible that even in the future it will be fully or partially funded in this way. In the meantime, unfortunately, we know that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

In short, the big question—will the republic's KGB be yet another police structure above our heads or will it be a department that exists within a framework dictated by a democratic society—still remains open.

## Chances of Yeltsin, Ryzhkov 'About Equal'

*PM0506160191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof. V. Korobeynikov, chief of a department of the Soviet State Building and Legislation All-Union Research Institute: "Presidential Elections: Attempt at a Forecast"]

[Text] Forecasts of election results have a very substantial tradition and are highly productive in many democratic countries of the world. The developed network of centers and services for the study of public opinion and the constant improvement of forecasting tools in numerous political science institutes make it possible to predict with great accuracy (to within 3-4 percent) the victory of a particular candidate for a deputy's seat or state post. Such surveys are part of a scientific field combining sociology, political science, social psychology, and law and usually designated by the English term "electoral studies."

Election forecasts are made not only in order to determine the actual winner. Their tasks are far broader. They make it possible to reveal the qualitative and quantitative parameters of trends in political development, prospects for the formation of various processes, and possible shifts in their evolution. In short, the accumulation of scientific information about the specific nature of public opinion among voters and their electoral behavior is of tremendous significance for interpreting the extent of the development of democracy in the country.

As far as our country is concerned, the scientific field in question simply could not emerge in conditions of totalitarianism and unanimous votes for a single candidate appointed from above. Only the reform of the electoral system providing for a choice among several candidates and competition among contenders for the mandate opened the way for diversity in citizens' electoral behavior.

A practical need to create an appropriate system for election analysis and forecasting has emerged. To be blunt, we still have a long way to go before it emerges. After all, it requires considerable expenditure, modern means of communication and information gathering, and good-quality computer equipment. At present neither state nor public organizations are prepared to invest money in this, although now, at the height of the election campaign, many of them would certainly pay quite substantial sums to learn who is going to become president of Russia.

Nevertheless, despite the difficulty of their position, Soviet specialists in the sphere of electoral studies now have certain information about the particular features of the present election in the USSR, the typology of Soviet voters, and the stock actions of contenders for particular mandates. One of the leading factors determining voters' attitude toward elections and the nature of the voting is the general socioeconomic background in the region and the country as a whole. Clearly, it is the work of a moment to show that this background is extremely unfavorable at present. The ordinary voter feels the impact of economic and production disarray primarily in the material position of his family, which has deteriorated sharply as a result of the increase in the cost of living.

As foreign studies and our own research show, the deterioration in the socioeconomic situation has various consequences for an election campaign. Let us note two of them: increased passiveness on the part of voters and an increase in the chances of candidates whose program contains more in the way of well founded specific measures to change the situation for the better. A great deal, especially everything concerning promises to change the situation, depends on the voter's ability to analyze the prevailing situation, and this ability is composed of knowledge of electoral legislation, familiarity with the candidates' programs and biographies, the amount and quality of information, discussion of election problems among colleagues, friends, and family, and so forth.

In terms of practically all these indicators the presidential election campaign in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] presents a depressing picture. Let me remind you that the legislation on introducing the post of RSFSR president and electing him appeared only in late April and some of its norms incorporated in the republic's Constitution appeared even later—in mid-May, during the Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Here we can anticipate the emergence of at least two trends—an increase in the [number of] voters who, aware of their incompetence, will simply seek to avoid voting. At the same time candidates whose actions and experience of life are well known will have an advantage in this situation. When it comes to the present election, as you know, this applies to N. Ryzhkov and B. Yeltsin, and to a lesser extent to V. Bakatin.

As research carried out in our country in 1989-1990 showed, as a rule four groups of voters emerge in every election: those who take no part in the voting; those who vote against all the candidates; those who vote without having made up their minds; and those who vote consciously for a specific candidate. On the basis of the foregoing, we can conclude that the first three groups will be very sizable in the upcoming election.

Analysis of social-demographic and regional aspects is very important for forecasting elections. What is the Russian electorate like from this viewpoint? First a few figures. It is well known that over 105 million people were placed on the list for voting in the Russian Federation during the March referendum. Clearly, we will have a similar figure during the RSFSR presidential election. This means that for the election to be deemed valid, around 53 million people must go to the polling places. On the basis of the trends recorded during the 1989-1990 elections, it can be supposed with a great degree of probability that, unless unforeseen events occur in the remaining days, 65-75 million voters will actually vote. This means that a candidate must secure the support of 33-38 million Russian citizens in order to win the election in the first round.

Polls carried out recently by various organizations have shown the following trend: B. Yeltsin is more actively supported by the urban population and younger voters. On this basis it has been concluded that the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has a great advantage. Indeed, the urban population greatly outnumbers the rural population in the structure of the Russian electorate, and we have more voters under the age of 50 than representatives of the older generation. Nevertheless, in our view it is premature to speak of a great advantage for Yeltsin. His main supporters are concentrated in the big cities, especially Moscow, Leningrad, and Sverdlovsk. But there may not be enough of them for overall victory. Yeltsin's main rival is certainly N. Ryzhkov, who enjoys support among residents of medium and small cities, older citizens, and the rural population.

In this situation the outcome of the election will clearly be decided by winning over supporters in the main regions of the republic. It is well known that the Russian Federation is subdivided into 11 economic regions which are totally different in terms of the distribution of the electorate. According to our calculations, it is sufficient for a presidential candidate to secure an advantage in four of them—the Central, Volga, North Caucasus, and Urals Regions—in order to celebrate an overall victory.

At present the chances of the two main presidential contenders, in my view, can be regarded as about equal.

## Yeltsin Running Mate Rutskoy Interviewed

*91UN1641A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 31 May 91 p 1*

[Report on interview with Aleksandr Rutskoy, RSFSR vice presidential candidate, by Viktor Ukolov: "Rutskoy Is Not Simple...."]

[Text] **I met Aleksandr Rutskoy at the last plenum of Russia's Communist Party Central Committee. His speech caused—how can I put it in a more diplomatic way?—a certain "noise in the audience." During the break he rushed outside to cool off, and stood there smoking eagerly. He wanted to finish arguing.**

[Rutskoy] I could not be silent or talk differently; that would have meant going against my conscience. What kind of proposal did we hear? A collection of trite slogans and nothing concrete. That was why I said from the podium: Stop feeding theories of socialism or capitalism to the people, all they want is to live like human beings.

[Ukolov] Whoever you listen to, everybody says that his concern is for the people. But what do we have in reality?

[Rutskoy] I would say that it is time to stop our endless debates about who is more of a Communist or who is more of a democrat. We should start acting, "sweating it out" all together. We cannot stand in opposition to the Supreme Soviet elected by our people, to the legitimate government.[end Rutskoy]

This is A. Rutskoy's credo which, like an attractive magnet, helped him to gather numerous supporters in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. By the end of the extraordinary congress they had formed a new parliamentary group "Communists for Democracy."

Local support for the position of the parliamentary group is growing more and more. Unfortunately, this process is accompanied by our usual mental confusion: Can this lead to the formation of a new "Democratic Platform" and a split in the CPSU? I do not think so. It might possibly result in a general shift of the Russian Communist Party to the left.

In any case, at the Central Committee plenum A. Rutskoy shouted over comments from the audience as he declared: "I am a Communist, a Central Committee member, and I am not going to leave the party!"

The other day, just before the last congress of Russian people's deputies ended, A. Rutskoy invited a group of journalists to meet with him in the Supreme Soviet. As the head of the Committee for Invalid and War and Labor Veteran Affairs, and for Social Protection of the Military and Their Dependents, he told us about the work of his committee. He showed us a thick folder:

"These are all the approved social programs that we have designed."

At that meeting Aleksandr Vladimirovich told us about himself: He was shot down in the Afghan sky and got a spinal column injury. But he went back to fighting after the hospital. He was taken prisoner and exchanged for a scout.... He was decorated with the Gold Star.

[Ukolov] Do you have to "sweat it out" a lot here, in the Supreme Soviet?

[Rutskoy] My working day starts at 0700 and ends at about 0130 or 0200. My family is not talking to me any more.

[Ukolov] Is your family in Moscow?

[Rutskoy] I was given a temporary deputy's apartment. I did not earn any other. People ask me: "Where are you registered?" I am not registered anywhere.[end Rutskoy]

However, Rutskoy was keeping something back. I asked him a straight question: "Are you going to participate in the presidential elections as a candidate?" His answer was: "I would participate with pleasure, with one single purpose—to give all my votes to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin."

The next day "The Latest News" named Rutskoy as candidate for vice president, running with Yeltsin.

He is not quite simple, that Aleksandr Vladimirovich!

### Views Siberian Campaign

*LD0506193791*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1911 GMT on 4 June carries a 12-minute report by correspondent Vladimir Kuzhnik who is accompanying Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] vice presidential candidate running on the same ticket as Yeltsin, on his election campaign. Kuzhnik is reporting from Krasnoyarsk.

Barnaul and Krasnoyarsk are the places that journalists have described as Yeltsin's "blank spots" on the map of Russia, since public opinion has clearly been running against Yeltsin there. In an interview recorded in Krasnoyarsk, Rutskoy gives his first impressions of the election meetings in Siberia

"The first and most characteristic thing is that these meetings really have not been fixed, as used to be the case. The people who come to our meetings really want to come."

Kuzhnik asks: "As you have told me, and as you tell your voters, you are endeavoring to conduct our campaign exclusively on matters of principle, without touching upon the personalities of other candidates and without resorting to any unparliamentary and unworthy methods. Now then, it has come to our notice that high-level party organizations here have prepared material in connection with your arrival which is being distributed to all well-wishers and which contains all sorts of reports discrediting you, and your senior Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. What do you have to say to this? You do know about it, don't you?"

Rutskoy answers: "I was given a big sheaf of pamphlets today, and told to draw my conclusions on them. Everything put together there is literally shear filth, that's the only way one can describe the material about Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Then there's the works—if that's the right description—of the ideological department of the kray CPSU committee, where the preamble states: The elections are taking place in a period of mutual hatred. Well, how can one think up such a thing, especially a party that describes itself as a party of the people? You'll pardon me, but who is it that hates whom, and who is it who is inflaming all these passions, then?"

Kuzhnik comments that the Krasnodar area is noted for backing Ryzhkov: How does Rutskoy assess his chances there? Rutskoy says that he has to work with people, and that his meetings so far have shown how much people are thirsting for information about the work of the Russian parliament, because "the central press does not publish these documents in full, and PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA are mostly engaged in gathering rubbish and filth. So when you actually meet people, when you have direct contact, and you start to describe various situations, people do understand, and come to agree that fundamental measures really must be taken on issues concerning those people who are below the poverty level—and that means tens of millions of people on the territory of the Russian Federation. I do indeed see as my number-one task civil concord, ethnic concord, civil peace, and the main position which really must be implemented is the position and program for these people who have ended up below the poverty level. Our intention is to set up a credit and investment bank for organized privatization, assistance for development of enterprise, and also for resolving questions of social programs, because strange as it may seem, there is a black spot in Russia's budget in this regard." Rutskoy has, he says, brought the kray and town soviets draft documents on the social development of Russia, which give the regions the opportunity to implement their social programs thanks to the measures the Supreme Soviet has adopted. Rutskoy is offended by the "propaganda" against the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers, to the effect that "the Russian Government and Supreme Soviet do not want to resolve anything in regard to the countryside, but along will come Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and he'll settle everything." Rutskoy is not against the priority development of the countryside, he merely opposes the program drawn up by the Supreme Soviet Commitee on Agrarian Policy and the Countryside which he describes as too general and declarative. Rutskoy calls for a specific and definite program.

Rutskoy had two memorable meetings in Barnaul, a meeting in the aviation training school he himself graduated from, and an unveiling ceremony at a monument in the center of Barnaul to young people from Altay killed in Afghanistan. Asked his reaction to this, both as a serviceman and as a potential Russian vice-president and politician, Rutskoy replies: "You know, I'm not trying for the post of vice-president. I gave my assent to run with Boris Nikolayevich with the aim of helping him in this situation. What interests me most of all is that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin should become president. I have already voiced by position on this matter, because if the people have put their trust in Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and in him as chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, he has coped with this. The partocrats can shout and scream that Boris Nikolayevich has done nothing as much as they like—pardon me, but let's

just take a look at what they have done and what Boris Nikolayevich has done. And then, in effect, most of the time has been spent on the fight for Russia's sovereignty. I have seen no other presidential candidate today who has made even the slightest contribution to resolving the question of Russia's sovereignty. But Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was there, you know, when the Russian Federation referendum was held and a rabid fight was under way against the Russian Federation referendum. The Russian Communist Party was against introducing presidential rule. But now it has already come to be in favor of it, now it has nominated Nikolay Ivanovich Rykzhkov."

Returning to the question of the meetings in Barnaul, Rutskoy reminisces on his career at the Barnaul training college; it was in Barnaul that he began his professional career, and now he has returned to start out his political career. The meeting with servicemen was full of nostalgia. Rutskoy adds that he himself is continuig to fight, but continuing to fight for justice on this earth: "I am continuing to fight for the revival of great Russia, because in my understanding, there can be no great Soviet Union without a great Russia... you know, life was no bowl of cherries there in Afghanistan, and it's no bowl of cherries for me today, either."

### Presidential Candidate Makashov Answers Questions

*LD0506144691*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1848 GMT on 4 June, in its "Who's Who" program, carries a 70-minute interview with Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) presidential candidate General Albert Mikhaylovich Makashov.

Makashov reads a list of theses on his presidential program, in which he stresses law and order. A planned economy will prevent enemployment, speculation will be prevented, and prices will be reduced, he says. He adds that the prestige of the armed forces will be raised.

He then replies to questions from representatives of rival candidates, except Ryzhkov, who refused to contribute. In response, he denies that he is a neo-Stalinist. He avoids answering a question on what he means when he uses the term "cosmopolitans." He outlines how he would handle the complaints of the miners. He says that if he is elected, there will be cadre changes so that true patriots are employed.

Makashov then answers questions from central media journalists. A PRAVDA correspondent asks if Makashov's meetings with the electorate have influenced his policies. Makashov answers in the affirmative, saying that they have made him more precise and against speculation.

A SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reporter asks Makashov to comment on the other candidates' attitudes to the armed forces, conversion of military industry and activities, and withdrawal from Eastern Europe. Makashov replies: "What is my attitude to be to leaders who over the past 50 years, save for Vlasov, state that Soviet soldiers should not fulfill the orders given by Soviet commmanders? This sort of thing took place in the Baltic republics. My attitude toward this is negative. In my view, Bakatin does not know the armed forces, even though he used to be the first secretary of an oblast committee. Apparently the armed forces' needs and requirements are close to Comrade Tuleyev's heart. Comrade Ryzhkov is conversant with the problems of the armed forces and is capable of rendering substantial assistance in this matter. The second question is about conversion. This has not been thought through. There is no law on conversion. At present a process of destruction is underway of the one and only complex in our country that is in the forefront of scientific and technological progress. It should have been put to correct and organized use for the external [changes thought] for our internal market, including, perhaps, our external market. Unfortunately, this represents yet another mistake—our leaders' haste in destroying our military industrial complex."

He is reminded that the third question is on what can be called the disorderly withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe. Makashov responds: "You have answered the question yourself. It is indeed disorderly. In order to withdraw its 30,000-strong army from the Rhine, Britain needed seven years. France needed five years. For us, as soon as the treaty was signed, the wheels began moving the following morning. This was a hasty and ill considered move indeed. It could have been possible to make the troop withdrawal more important, perhaps by including the idea of NATO ceasing to exist."

A female MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reporter asks if Makashov can guarantee that, if elected, the armed forces will not be used against civilians. Makashov answers: "In all countries of the world, in accordance with the Constitution, the armed forces are used for both external and internal tasks. Any governor of a state in the United States has the right to use the National Guard—that is an army—beginning with rendering assistance with fires or floods to the suppression of rebellion in this or that black ghetto. The armed forces cannot remain indifferent if something wrong is taking place. If it were not for the armed forces, what is currently taking place in our country in the Caucasus would have been terrifying. Believe me, I know this issue, and I would not advise you to delve into matter, which you, as a woman, simply know nothing about. It is only the armed forces that can save us from a full-blooded civil war."

Asked why the army can be ordered to use weapons against the civilian population, Makashov replies: "The army does not do anything of its own will. It fulfills the will of politicians."

A KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reporter asks about defending the interests of Russians outside the RSFSR. Makashov says: "It is our right, the right of the Russian people, the right of the Russian government and president, to defend Russians who are beyond the confines of their

republics. By the way, to revenge the killing of two Americans in Panama Bay, the Americans routed the armed forces of a sovereign republic and seized the legitimate presideni, no matter what kind of person he might be. They said the Panama Canal was a zone of their vital interests. Millions of people, Russian people, who live beyond the confines of Russia, represent a zone of our vital interests. The Russian people who live outside Russia, in other republics, should know that the government of Russia and its presidents will always defend them, for they are our vital interests."

A TRUD reporter asks Makashov about his attitude toward the workers' movement as it exists at present. Makashov replies that reforms have not helped the workers.

An IZVESTIYA reporter notes that opinion polls show low support for the Communist Party. Makashov says these figures are false. He says other parties should be legal.

A KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reporter asks about law and order. Makashov says that law enforcement bodies should strictly fulfill their instructions.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reporter Sergey Parkhomenko asks: "Albert Mikhaylovich, approximately a month ago, in a good recording of an interview you did in our sound studio for NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, you defended the necessity of continuing nuclear tests in the Soviet Union. It is clear now that the government of Kazakhstan will close the Semipalatinsk testing ground. Then the burden of these test will have to be borne by the testing ground in Novaya Zemlya. I have research materials here done by the independent Greenpeace organization. These show that a week's stay there even now will give a man what amounts to an annual radiation dose of 50 becquerels per square centimeter. That is the radiation level. Do you continue to insist on having this barbaric activity continue there, in the country, and in Russia, sacrificing for military puposes the huge territory of the Russian north—not just Novaya Zemlya—together with the peoples who populate these territories?"

Makashov replies: "Nuclear testing is done both for military purposes and for peacful purposes. New ammunition is tested. Old ammunition that had been stored in arsenals for a certain period is tested both for the people's needs and for national economic needs. Such testing constantly goes on in the United States, in the state of Nevada. For some reason, you at NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA and elsewhere fail to become indignant about that testing done in the state of Nevada. For some reason, Americans come to us, calling for a march on Semipalatinsk to be organized in order to get our testing banned. Where is the elementary honesty here? Where is the gentlemanly spirit and ordinary decency? They are permitted to test, but we are not. It is a matter of state—I repeat, it is a matter of state—because what we do have at present in regard to our nuclear missile potential currently serves as a deterrent to both sides. If we now unilaterally destroy it, as we have done with most things, they will have everything intact. Why is is that we do not have simultaneous marches in our country against Semipalatinsk and a march there? Why is it that in our own country we are not patriots? Why is it that we demand a domestic ban and do not demand a ban where our neighbors are concerned? I would like NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA—although I question that name, for there are no independent papers ["nezavisimaya" means "independent"]—to strive with the same insistence and stubbornness for a worldwide ban."

An unidentified voice agrees that the double standard seems to be applying. Makashov continues: "Believe me, I know this matter better than you. The Totskiy testing ground is in my district. It is the one that your colleagues have made so much fuss about, saying there is radiation. There is practically nothing at the Totskiy testing ground. Even during the time that has elapsed and in regard to the background radiation, there is less there than in Arbat."

A GLASNOST reporter questions Makashov's attitude about private property. In response, Makashov says that property can be bought with money earned by hard work. Then a ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA reporter questions a point from Makashov's program regarding a shadow economy. Following this, representatives of the other presidential candidates ask further questions, including: Should the production of medicine be curbed in the interests of ecology? Would Makashov's presidency lead to dictatorship? Makashov says no, only a dictatorship of law. Is he intolerant? Makashov says he wants democracy, not chaos. How will he ensure that workers have an interest in their work? Makashov says planning has achieved the greatest results in the past.

More questions from journalists follow. A SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reporter asks who Makashov will be voting for in the elections. Makashov says he will naturally vote for himself. He satisfies a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reporter by noting that everything depends on the personal qualities of the leader.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA asks whether Makashov will use armed force to protect the interests of Russians abroad. Makashov answers: "Of course. Why is it that we bashfully pass it over in silence and avert our gaze when the graves of our fathers and grandfathers are smashed on the territory of Europe, even though it was us who liberated these people from fascism? Why is it that monuments to our commanders and the founders of our state are pulled down? What are we—incapable of firmly saying no, don't you dare, even in a diplomatic way? The diplomats begin things, but the army is the king's final argument. The guns can always have their say, although it is the diplomats who ought to solve things to begin with. There are economic means, but one must stand up for one's own state."

A KURANTIY reporter asks why the Soyuz group supports Ryzhkov and not Makashov, who responds that it is up to them. A TRUD reporter asks what Makashov will do about ethnic problems. Makashov says that the unity of Russia must be preserved.

A MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reporter asks whether the armed forces should only obey legally elected bodies, or whether national salvation committees are acceptable. Makashov replies: "The army does not act on the orders of national salvation committees. I know what you are talking about. Let us put aside your question and my reply until the materials of an official investigation are at hand, otherwise you think one thing and I know different. Let us put the official investigation on the table. Only then will you be asking your questions." This is what Makashov says.

A PRAVDA reporter asks what Makashov will do as president to prevent bullying in the army. He says he will prevent recruitment of criminals and prevent construction units from working for various ministries.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA asks about Makashov's reaction to the procurator general's report on the events in Vilnius. Makashov says that not enough concern is shown for the Russian-speaking population of the Baltics.

Asked by ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA what he would do about former Communist Party members who have become speculators, Makashov says he would use legal measures. Then a GLASNOST reporter asks about Makashov's attitude on a professional army. Makashov says he opposes a mercenary army.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA asks more about protecting the interests of Russians in the Baltics. Makashov says that some Russian leaders do not show enough concern for the Russians there. Then an IZVESTIYA reporter refers back to Makashov's statement that people were more prosperous in the past, citing his comments on privations. Makshov says that the advantages of socialism are not being fully used.

A MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reporter asks about Makashov's attitude to the Military for Democracy movement. Maksahov says that if they support price rises, they cannot really be concerned about the people. A KURANTIY reporter then asks what Makashov's first three presidential decrees will be. Makashov replies that he will carry out monetary reform, exchanging at a rate of one to 10 up to 10,000 to 15,000 rubles. PRAVDA asks what he will do for women. Makashov says he makes no promises, but if his policies work and prosperity increases, help will be given to those who need it. ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA asks whether the army will continue to gather in the harvest, and Makashov replies that this will happen.

On the subject of his expected relationship with the center, Makashov says he expects there to be friction. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA asks how he regards the hostility of the press. Makashov says he thinks it is because he is so forthright in his views.

Asked which book he would rescue from a fire, Makashov says it would be a history of Russia. The program concludes with Makashov responding to a question asking who suggested he run by saying that it was his own decision.

## Explains Views

*91UN1666A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 22, 1 Jun 91 p 8*

[Interview with Colonel General A.M. Makashov, RSFSR presidential candidate, by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent A. Prazdnikov in Samara; date not given: "Albert Makashov: 'I Am of My People, and I Know Their Needs'"]

[Text] [Prazdnikov] Albert Mikhaylovich, was your nomination as a candidate for president of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] a surprise to you?

[Makashov] It was. But if we introduce presidents in each oblast and each rayon, and we change them like gloves, then a nomination for president will not be a surprise to anyone.

[Prazdnikov] But what, in your opinion, would serve as the reason for your nomination as a candidate?

[Makashov] I think, patriotism. The very same patriotism that is natural for each true citizen of his country and republic. I expressed this feeling in a speech at the constituent congress of the RSFSR Communist Party and brought down a drumfire of criticism. Not only on myself, but on the army as well. However, the working people see a strength in the Soviet Army that is not subject to political games, and on which you can rely.

[Prazdnikov] A question that probably everyone asks you: What will you say regarding the fact that a general might end up in the RSFSR president's chair?

[Makashov] In world history, generals have already been presidents. General Eisenhower in the United States and General de Gaulle in France, in my opinion, coped fairly well with presidential duties. No worse than movie actor Reagan, who, as he promised, also played this role successfully. Especially since our generals are all from among the people and not isolated from life. I am also of the people, and I know their needs.

[Prazdnikov] What is your preelection campaign?

[Makashov] While preserving socialist values, we must do everything for the working person, but not for the latter-day entrepreneurs, who in our country amount to four-five percent of the whole population.

I am against unemployment, against the exploitation of man by man, against increasing and liberalizing prices,

and against the sale of Russia under the hazy slogan of privatization. I am against private property in the means of production, except for small-scale commodity production and the services sphere; against private ownership of land, although I do not exclude one-man management of agriculture (I do not perceive the application of the word farmer to our conditions).

In politics, I am for dictatorship. For the dictatorship of law, the Constitution, and human rights.

In the humanitarian sphere, I am for the restoration of the history and culture of Russia, and for putting an end to the Americanization that is overwhelming the art of the stage, variety theater, and the screen; for the support of what is national, patriotic, and of the indigenous population; for the observance and development of national traditions of all peoples that populate the republic, but without any tinge of nationalism and chauvinism. I am for a united and indivisible Russia within its 1945 borders.

[Prazdnikov] How do we now assemble our state, which is divided by a multiparty system, interethnic discord, and economic dissension? What is Russia's role in this process?

[Makashov] The split of our Union state looks very strange. Georgia declared its own full sovereignty. But it has not turned down 7 billion rubles from the Union budget. The so-called Baltia [Baltic area], which also declared its secession from the Union, does not shrink from receiving our products at prices that are by no means those of the international market.

The solution is in the unity of forces of the people populating the country on the basis of the common idea of a national Russian patriotism, the patriotism of a citizen of the USSR.

[Prazdnikov] Why did you choose Aleksey Alekseyevich Sergeyev for the candidacy of vice president? Your opinion of the figure of vice president of the RSFSR.

[Makashov] Aleksey Alekseyevich is a doctor of economic sciences, member of the CPSU Central Committee, and a Muscovite—he is close to me in his views on the socioeconomic and political future of Russia and of the whole country. He became an especially notable figure since he came out with the idea that there is an alternative to the market (I will remark parenthetically that there is an alternative to everything in life, and market relations cannot be an exception—this would be against all rules). As a personality, Sergeyev is an extremely decent, honest, and courageous person, which also impresses me.

## Tuleyev Views Strikes, Economic Program, Army

*91UN1622A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 May 91 First Edition p 2*

[Report on interview with A.M. Tuleyev, candidate for president of the RSFSR, by Captain 3rd Rank V. Yermolin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Russia Brings All of Us Together"]

[Text] [Yermolin] Aman-Geldy Moldagazyyevich....

[Tuleyev] You can call me "Aman Gumirovich"—that is what all of my friends and acquaintances call me.

[Yermolin] Aman Gumirovich, we will begin where everything begins—with childhood.

[Tuleyev] I grew up, as the saying goes, in a simple family. My father was a Kazakh. He died when I was two years old. My stepfather—a Russian—was a worker, a loader. I thought of him as my natural father. Mother was a Tatar, a worker in a bread-baking plant. Besides me in the family, there were a brother and sister. I will not say that we lived in poverty. We had enough to live. Although our needs were modest. In general, since childhood, and later in my youth also, it turned out that for practically my entire life people around me were modest and upright, you know, sloggers. It was not the "guardian angel" and not telephone calls that made my way in life, but work, which I like very much, and also those who worked with me. I arrived in the Kuzbass immediately after completing technical secondary school, and I was accepted in the worker family as one of their own. So, I consider myself a nominee for the post of president from below.

[Yermolin] But, frankly, how did you get the idea of taking part in such a troublesome and risky enterprise?

[Tuleyev] Naturally, presidential authority in itself does not have sufficient significance for me. I simply came to this point when it became clear that no one wanted to think seriously about the economy of Russia. I finally came to this conclusion after Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's last trip through the Kuzbass. I am firmly convinced of this. And if no one intends to work on the economy—the very foundation of our life—then that is it, it is the end. We have been very successful in politicizing anything and everything. But politics does not feed, and it does not clothe. In general, I would introduce a distinctive moratorium on politics, at least at first, in order to recover one's breath and to get down to business. At work, a person's head should be occupied with work most of all. And for the economy—full democracy. Without restrictions. The main thing today is to separate economics from politics. Otherwise, ruin.

[Yermolin] Probably, the future president must have his own attitude toward the strike movement?

[Tuleyev] Speaking about our strikes, I will emphasize: These strikes could have been prevented. They should have been prevented. But the government itself was

pushing the miners to extremes, ignoring the grief and despair of the people. And afterwards, of course, many began to pile up their own political capital. I saw who visited the Kuzbass in those days and for what reason: The economy did not alarm any of the guests. Politics alone excited them. And when deputies came to a mine and said: "We are from Boris Nikolayevich, stop your work!"—I consider this a crime. After all, it is not with shouts and slogans that life can be improved, but with an economically competent organization of work. But I want to emphasize that my depressing disclosures with respect to the present prospects of reviving the Russian economy still did not in themselves suggest the idea of the presidency. But when I was told that more than 300,000 countrymen gave me their votes, that is, their signatures, it was then that I said to myself: If the people trust me, then I must do everything to support their trust. And I had more than enough desire to serve Russians faithfully and truthfully

[Yermolin] Three hundred thousand signatures speak for themselves. But you also have a lot of opponents?

[Tuleyev] For many, my candidacy was very irritating. Especially the supporters of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. For some reason it is assumed here that if you are campaigning for the post of president you are against Yeltsin. But I will repeat once more: I am not against Yeltsin, and not against Ryzhkov and Bakatin. I am for myself and for my own program, inasmuch as I believe that I will be of benefit to Russia. And, by the way, if I lose in the very first stage, then I will not call on those who voted for me to give their votes to one or another candidate. I realize that I do not have much of a chance. First of all, the brevity of the election campaign places candidates in unequal conditions. I am known in the Kuzbass and in other mining regions, but it is unlikely that my name is known in central Russia and in its northern rayons. And the democratic press, according to my observations, generally is trying to remain silent about me. But when it does write, it would be better if... it did not write. For example, some report to their readers that Tuleyev is almost a villain—he got 300,000 signatures for himself through trickery. But, how could I do this? How can such a lie be printed? Should there not be some kind of boundaries of decency and honesty even in an election campaign?

[Yermolin] Aman Gumirovich, a few words about your economic program.

[Tuleyev] We adopted an anticrisis program in Russia, but it will not pass. I know this well. It is necessary to conduct economic reform through regions. I proceed from the fact that each region has its own market, its own features, and its own capabilities to develop one or another branch of the economy. Therefore, first of all, I would ensure a high degree of freedom of economic management of each industrial and rural region. But, in the region, everything has to be started with the person. Give him an opportunity to earn well, and eliminate all administrative restrictions. Let him sense that everything depends on his ability to work and to engage in business undertakings. The next stage: complete freedom of enterprise. Right down to international business contacts, the sale of products where the enterprise desires, and the choice of forms of property according to its own discretion. And no kinds of centralized campaigns. Such as, for example, the unbridled, I cannot find a better word, privatization that is now being planned for Russia. Whether you want it or not, carry out privatization. But, after all, there are regions where it is not profitable to do this, first and foremost because of economic considerations.... That is, greater trust in people in local production.

And, finally, more complete independence—from the person, through the enterprise, to the region. But state participation in the economy—through taxes. Here the system should be mobile and flexible. It was decided to bring in Toyota's from abroad instead of butter—bring them in, but in doing so pay the kind of tax so that a desire would appear, nevertheless, to replenish the market with products at first. But today I cannot even receive a license for my own region. Here is where the problem is. And, in the meantime, there are only talks. Just politics. Everyone today condemns the state order. But why are firms in the West fighting for state orders? Well, because it is profitable for them. It is profitable for them to do business with such a partner and customer as the state. So, I also want to make the state a reliable partner and a profitable customer for our industrialists and for our entire economy.

This is reflected more and more in my program. Everything cannot be related in a short interview. But I ask that you consider that I am proceeding from practical work and from a knowledge of the situation specifically from below. This is where my advantage lies, although there is also a difficulty for me here—inadequate large-scale analysis and information. However, I hope to overcome these difficulties, if there is support.

[Yermolin] Then, after being elected president, what would you start out with on your first working day?

[Tuleyev] The economy, I repeat, is the main thing for me. But I would start with a fight against crime. It is abnormal when a person does not know whether he will be able to stay alive today, and be able to get home without being robbed, and whether his wife or daughter will be raped. Things have gone too far. I assure you that Russians will sense immediately that the president has seriously undertaken to bring order. In my opinion, the criminal world has never felt so untrammeled before. This has to be stopped, and in the harshest and most decisive way.

[Yermolin] Crime is multifaceted. And one of its dismal faces is nationalism. It has turned out all of a sudden that there is no nation in the country, including in Russia, that is not offended and not deprived of something. Much is being said also about the particularly dramatic

position of the Russian individual. As an aspirant to the post of president of Russia, what do you think about all of this?

[Tuleyev] I will say frankly that I do not think that the Russian person has to be especially defended today in some way. All of us, people of different nations and national roots, have ended up in a dramatic situation, all of us have suffered from the lawlessness of the past and from today's social and economic cataclysms. Now all of us are living impoverished. And to get on solid ground, it is only necessary to do it together, supporting one another. But who asks, for example, in a coal face, what nationality are you? Who thinks of dividing a work crew according to national features? There has not been and there is nothing like this. So Russia also is the same for everyone; she is our motherland. Honestly, I would write generally in the passport column: Russian. Perhaps I am not right, but I am moved by the desire to unite people and make them better toward each other. Let them not think about differences, but about that which brings us closer together. But Russia brings all of us closer together.

[Yermolin] But it is interesting, if Tuleyev becomes president, whether he will not have the desire to become commander in chief of the Russian Army?

[Tuleyev] Heaven forbid. I am for a united and powerful Soviet Union and, of course, the army should be the same for everybody—the USSR Armed Forces. Russia's own army is an absurdity. But, as the Russian president, I would start with the restoration of a respectful, and even reverent, attitude of the citizens to their army. I would publicly bow deeply to the military people—to the officers and soldiers of our fatherland. After all, 90 percent of the newspapers and journals now are bolstering the prestige of a foreign army. But we throw mud at our own defenders, and we deprive them of attention, housing, money, and elementary human concern.

I think that it would be correct to ban public disparagement of the Soviet Army, and no one will dare to defame it. But what is going on now around the army is lunacy. Conversion is also being conducted insanely and criminally. So much is being said about this, but we are continuing to squander and destroy the most valuable world level of technology, and we are forcing the elite of Soviet engineering to rivet pots and pans. In the meantime, given a skillful combination of efforts and interests, enterprises of the defense industry that are situated on the territory of Russia could be actively included in the economy of the Russian regions. Undoubtedly, taking defense interests into account. Russia is rich with raw materials and people. And if we merge the advanced technology of the "defense industry" with our economy, then things will improve. But we must not talk with the army and with the military industrial complex as some are trying to talk—in a condescending and demanding way, and in an insulting tone. It is dangerous, as is well-known, to offend the honor of a military person.

[Yermolin] Aman Gumirovich, and did you yourself get to serve?

[Tuleyev] Of course, I am a noncommissioned officer in the reserve. I served in the Transbaykal. It seems that a note was made in the military commissariat: "fit for political work."

[Yermolin] But they did not specify "fit for president of Russia?"

[Tuleyev] Unfortunately, no. But it would be apropos.

## On Reform of State Power

*91UN1588A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 25 May 91 p 1*

[Interview with Aman-Geldy Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet and candidate for RSFSR president, by Almira Kozhakhmetova; place and date not given: "Nominated by the Kuzbass"]

[Text] *During the recent extraordinary russian congress, an individual went to the podium whose speech dumbfounded many. Well, if not the entire body of deputies, at least the members of the Supreme Soviet. "You have become familiar faces to all Russia. Your images flash across the television screen, but we see no results!" stated Aman-Geldy Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet and presently a candidate for RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president.*

[Kozhakhmetova] Aman-Geldy Gumirovich, that presentation brought you recognition. But is it what led you to aim for the presidency?

[Tuleyev] That was not of my will. The collectives of 60 enterprises submitted the name Tuleyev. And it is interesting that, of 350,000 signatures, 274,000 are from the Kuzbass. People collected the remainder in other cities. For me this was a complete surprise. I went recently to the Central Electoral Commission, and there they told me that 50 signatures had come in from Murom. I don't know anyone in Murom, but all the same—I thank the people who have supported me.

But I was nominated after B. Yeltsin came to see us in the Kuzbass. At that time the miners were striking. I was a nervous wreck then—kindergartens started closing, a little more and the electricity would have to be cut off. Almost every enterprise in the oblast was on the verge of shutting down. Yeltsin came and all the workers' committees assembled. I called for an end to the striking, which brings nothing but tremendous losses. And Yeltsin says: Go ahead and strike, call it off when you want. Not bad, right?

We argued pretty strongly, of course. But after all was said and done, he stated that we were not enemies, we just had differing views. Yes—as far as strikes are concerned, we have a divergence of principle. I understand why the miners are exasperated—erroneous state policy has brought them to despair. It all comes

together—increased prices, meager compensation, an incomprehensible five percent tax. The miners have nowhere to live. The air and water are poisoned, their children are sick. This is understandable, but why draw people "in a hopeless situation" into political games? I am certain that the recent strike was a part of such games. Many people understand this apparently. And after Yeltsin's departure, with the beginning of the election campaign, I found out I was nominated for president.

[Kozhakhmetova] If all of a sudden you are elected, you will begin pulling a heavy new load?

[Tuleyev] Right now I am simultaneously chairman of the oblast soviet and the oblast ispolkom [executive committee]. It is quite a load. The Kuzbass, by the way, is an entire state—3.5 million people live here. If I am able to cope here—why not try in the republic? They say: People are constantly striking where you are. But nobody realizes that the recent strike was the third—we were able to restrain people from two earlier ones. And these were threatened not in the spring, but in January. Do you understand what this means?

It seems to me I know the life of the working Kuzbass from within. I began as young lad working on the railroads. I made my way up, as they say, without any backing. Simple people helped me. Many times I was offered work in Moscow, for that same Ministry of Railways. But I did not want to leave the heartland.

[Kozhakhmetova] All the same, it seems to me your chances of winning are not great....

[Tuleyev] I have practically none at all. The way I see it, the elections are geared towards one particular individual. This is why we have the senselessly short time frame for the election campaign. Still, I do not understand why the hurry—if you are chairman of the Supreme Soviet, endowed with emergency powers, that is itself almost the presidency.

There are many purely subjective factors which will go against me, perhaps some in my favor as well. Let us take nationality, for example. My mother is Tatar, my father, Kazakh. He died when I was two years old. I was raised by my stepfather, a Russian. I have lived my entire life in Russia. My native language is Russian—I know no other. But the RSFSR is, as we know, a multiethnic state....

[Kozhakhmetova] If you became president, would you pursue a reform of state power?

[Tuleyev] Without fail. I believe that the president must simultaneously be the head of government. The congress must be dissolved—it is a Novgorod popular assembly which incurs only losses for the country. But the composition of the local soviets must be sharply reduced. I know in practice that it is impossible to work that way, the way it is working now. Here I am, chairman of the oblast soviet, and to whom am I subordinate? To Yeltsin? To Gorbachev? No, to the 250 deputies of our soviet. If they don't like the expression on your face—even if you're a genius—they can express lack of confidence. How can you make tough—but necessary—decisions under such circumstances?

There are a great many random people in the soviets, nonprofessionals. I am basically a candidate with experience. When I was nominated to USSR people's deputy, I was running in the same district with Yu. Golik, who is now adviser to the USSR president. He was a lawyer, and I had a "black mark" on my record—for two years I had worked as head of the transportation and communications department in the party obkom [oblast committee]. I was involved only in economic matters! But the people reacted as though flinging themselves upon an enemy because of this black mark. Probably if I had spent those two years in prison, I would have elicited greater sympathy—truly!

[Kozhakhmetova] What kind of economic program do you offer the people of Russia?

[Tuleyev] If I had to put it succinctly, I would say that the regions require maximum economic freedom. Within an overall policy framework, naturally. In order for us to be extricated from our predicament, it must be firmly stated that all base industries belong to the state. We must invest in them to the maximum. There are several hundred enterprises in Russia which have truly decisive influence. I would summon the directors and ask what they require for normal operation. Later on there would be complete emancipation. Including the necessity of removing all restrictions on wages. All remaining minor enterprises should be privatized.

[Kozhakhmetova] Aman-Geldy Gumirovich, how do you feel about compromise? If you are told, let us say—we will elect you president if you acknowledge that strikes are necessary?

[Tuleyev] What do you mean?! If I said only those things which are popular, I would long ago have risen higher.

## Bakatin Running Mate Abdulatipov Interviewed

*PM0506144691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Interview with R. Abdulatipov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities and RSFSR vice presidential candidate, by unnamed PRAVDA correspondent, under the rubric "Russia Facing a Choice"—date, place of interview not stated: "There Is Still a Chance"]

[Text] Among the contenders for the post of Russian vice president is R. Abdulatipov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. He is V. Bakatin's "running mate." Ramazan Gadzhimuradovich met with PRAVDA's correspondent and answered a number of questions.

[PRAVDA] What attracts you about V. Bakatin's program, why did you decide to run for vice president with him? After all, you had other offers, I believe.

[Abdulatipov] I did have other offers. But in my view Vadim Viktorovich's program is notable for its centrist positions and common sense. I think he has managed to find the link around which all the people of Russia could unite. It is extreme forces that are doing most to ruin Russia and the country. They are waging war on one another, and people suffer every day as a result. I think that politics today, and perhaps even more in the future, needs people with a sense of responsibility to the future.

Take the economy, for instance. We already have dozens of different programs, each of which is presented as the most brilliant product of economic thinking. But if we lack the politics of consensus, no economic program can extricate the country from its present situation.

[PRAVDA] That's true. But you have your own economic program, too, don't you?

[Abdulatipov] Obviously. First, we do not want to lock the economy into the plan system. Although, on the other hand, we cannot rush into the market and "build" it in a matter of 500 days. That is ridiculous. In the economic sphere, too, it is important to avoid extremes. Lenin's idea of planning was, of course, taken to absurd extremes in our country, but no civilized country can do without a plan. Today, in spheres where the state cannot cope, we must pursue a policy of phased privatization, but where it is coping, we must introduce other forms of ownership, but not sell things off.

The greatest danger today is that former ministry workers are appropriating the property of the whole people by setting up concerns. This is pure robbery, both of the state and of the people.

Or take another question: joint enterprises. At the French National Assembly I met with leaders of deputies' groups. They are also worried that today's Soviet market is attracting the most suspicious people, people who have no capital and no image. Thus we are discrediting our own economy from the outset.

[PRAVDA] The figure of Abdulatipov is a good "prop" for the figure of Bakatin. But why did you choose Bakatin?

[Abdulatipov] In principle, I have more or less answered that question already. Let me say in addition that people were obviously taking into account the idea that there should be a representative of the Muslim, Islamic world in the power structure. That has to be reckoned with nowadays.

Bakatin is also constantly being asked: Why did you choose Abdulatipov, who signed the anti-Yeltsin statement? But I did not sign an anti-Yeltsin statement, I called upon him to engage in normal, civilized politics. Our country is being ruined by the lack of consistency. Every three months we change our economic programs and political orientation. We have overstrained the people and the country. Therefore the figure that gives me personally the most hope in this respect is Bakatin. He has an up-to-date, civilized policy.

After all, we are promising very little. Promises are a bad thing here. Others have promised mountains of gold before now. Our stock of promises is not large. But the first promise we must fulfill—our duty, in fact—is to achieve national consensus.

Second, Russia is tired of revolutionary leaps. It needs an evolutionary, normal path of development.

Third, we must help those who cannot survive on their own in this situation, and not hinder those who can make their own way and help the state.

Another such aspect is stability in the family, without which the state is impossible. The moral and spiritual world and economic prosperity are all here. People should not be afraid of bringing children into the world. People should not be afraid of what will happen to their children tomorrow or the day after, when they will go to school, how they will marry. But social protection should be adapted for each region and each family. It is one thing for us to guarantee index-linking for all children, but another to take into account all the facts of life: national, territorial, and intellectual.

It is the state's job to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to work. You can promise anything. I think everything should be strengthened, from top to bottom, and a very strong executive power created.

Last, law and order must be strengthened. People should have nothing to fear in this society, they should sense the protection of the law. But there should also be discipline, dictated primarily by economic laws.

And the most important thing, as I am always saying: Today it is important for us to preserve our national and human dignity. Because a person can get a job or not get it. His refrigerator can be packed full, or empty. But if we lose the sense of national and human dignity, no transformations or reforms will ultimately be worth anything at all.

## Called 'Perceptive and Prestigious'

*91UN1641B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 31 May 91 p 1*

[Article by Almira Kozhakhmetova: "Abdulatipov Is With Bakatin, But He Could Have Been With Yeltsin"]

[Text] **If one remembers that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] consists of 16 autonomous formations (which now are independent, in fact) and that besides the Russians other ethnic groups also exist in Russia, Ramazan Abdulatipov is an ideal candidate for the vice presidency. He is the RSFSR Soviet of Nationalities chairman. He is an Avar, born in Dagestan.**

We have learned from unofficial sources that Boris Yeltsin also wanted to ask Abdulatipov to be his vice candidate. That did not happen because of the declaration by six members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of their disagreement with B.N. Yeltsin's policy. The "declaration of the six" was also signed by Ramazan Gadzhimuradovich.

Had the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman had the guts to ignore the personal affront and take Abdulatipov for his running mate, he would definitely gain serious support from the autonomies. In this case the people of the republics would see him as a force able to counterbalance the dictatorship of the Russian center on the one hand and as "our man" in Russia's leadership on the other.

Another candidate for the Russian presidency, Vadim Bakatin, demonstrated his political acumen by selecting Abdulatipov. He understood (and so he told his vice) that the economic problems besetting Russia may not be its biggest trouble. Ethnic feuding is worse. So, an expert in the area of ethnic relations should be the second person in the leadership of the republic; Ramazan Abdulatipov wrote his candidate and doctoral theses on the subject and recently created a department for the development and prognoses of interethnic relations under the Russian parliament.

Ramazan Abdulatipov is known in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet as a perceptive and prestigious politician. Many people claim though that he is guided by Staraya Square in his actions. Such claims are based on Abdulatipov's two years of work for the CPSU Central Committee Department of Ethnic Relations. This is how Abdulatipov responds to such reproaches: "While some people were making a career here, in Moscow, I was traveling from one dorm to another with my family; I studied in Dagestan, I worked beyond the Arctic Circle, in Murmansk."

Circles close to Abdulatipov insist that he is not getting any help from the Central Committee. Moreover, the Dagestan Party Obkom [Oblast Committee] is trying at present to conduct an anti-Bakatin campaign, which means an anti-Abdulatipov one.

Everybody who knows Ramazan Abdulatipov well comments on his hallowed respect for his roots—his motherland, his mother, his customs. He says that his father was a devoted Communist, his grandfather was a true Muslim who had gone on the hajj to Mecca. He is well versed in the history of his ancestors, likes to play the Dagestan musical instrument the pandura, and feels comfortable doing folk dances.

This is personal, of course. But it can explain a lot. It can explain, for instance, how careful and subtle this person will be in all matters of state if his third child was born a month and a half ago. It is a boy.

## Resolution on Election Observer Status Published

*91UN1588B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 3*

["Resolution of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet: On Introducing the Institution of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Observers Over the Conduct of Elections of the RSFSR President"]

[Text] In order to render organizational and procedural assistance to commissions on the conduct of elections of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium **resolves:**

1. To afford the status and rights of official observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium over the conduct of elections of the RSFSR president to RSFSR people's deputies.

2. To advise official observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to render assistance to commissions on the conduct of elections of RSFSR president with respect to implementation of the tasks entrusted to them.

3. In accordance with the RSFSR Law "On the Status of RSFSR People's Deputies" and Article 4 of the RSFSR Law "On Elections of RSFSR President," to charge official observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with obligation to facilitate the observance of legislation on the election of the RSFSR president.

4. To afford official observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium the right of access to all materials of the commissions on the conduct of elections of RSFSR president, to include materials located in military units, at any time during the operation of the commissions.

5. The Supreme Soviet presidiums of republics within the RSFSR, and the soviets of people's deputies and presidiums of krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, cities, rayons, settlements, and villages, will afford observers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and their representatives necessary assistance in the accomplishment of tasks entrusted to them.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

Moscow, House of Soviets, RSFSR

20 May 1991

## Eleven Candidates for Moscow Mayor Registered

*PM0406144191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report from IZVESTIYA, RIA, TASS, INTERFAX, REUTER, and UPI roundup: "Eleven Candidates for Mayor"]

[Text] The Moscow electoral commission, your IZVESTIYA correspondent reports, has officially registered and published a list of candidates for the posts of city mayor and vice mayor, for which elections will take place 12 June.

The ballot papers which Muscovites will be given will bear the nominations of Moscow City Soviet Deputies V. Anpilov (for mayor) and V. Chetverikov (for vice-mayor); A. Bryachikhin, chairman of the Sevastopolskiy Rayon Soviet, and L. Popov, prorector of a higher education establishment; V. Klyuyev, general director of a science and production association, and A. Solovyev, a doctor. The Socialist Party has nominated the following: RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist republic] People's Deputy T. Koryagin for mayor and Moscow City Soviet Deputy A. Popov for vice mayor; and the Conservative Party has nominated V. Kuvshinov, who is unemployed, for mayor, and L. Ubozhko, the party chairman, for vice mayor. The Social Democratic Party of Russia has nominated its members P. Kudyukin, a official of an RSFSR Supreme Soviet committee, and N. Khananashvili, the director of a cooperative.

The following have also been registered as candidates for the posts of the head of the executive in the capital and vice mayor: V. Rodionov, head of a sports center, and A. Volkov, a cooperative member; Moscow City Soviet Deputy V. Saykin and USSR People's deputy A. Krayko; M. Snezhkov, chairman of a student cooperative, and Ye. Ukhov, a research worker; I. Yuzvishin, chairman of the People's Information Party of Russia, and N. Kuptsov, deputy director of Moscow City Reference and Information Service. Labor collectives, the Moscow Voters Association, and the "Sotsprof" Association have nominated USSR People's Deputy G. Popov for the capital's mayor, and he has proposed Yu. Luzhkov, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee], for vice mayor.

### Control Commission Objects to Leningrad Renaming

*PM0506155091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1*

["Statement of the CPSU Central Control Commission Presidium"]

[Text] Leningrad City Soviet has scheduled 12 June as the date for a referendum on renaming Leningrad as St. Petersburg.

For many generations of Soviet people and Communists, Leningrad is not simply a geographical point on the map. It is the symbol of revolution, a tribute of respect to the man who was the father of the world's first socialist state. Leningrad and the Leningraders won the admiration of the world with their courage and staunchness in the tragic 900 days and nights of blockade.

During these days the party's central organs and the mass media are receiving numerous appeals from Communists and people of various political views, ages, and nationalities. They express outrage at the moral insensitivity and unconcealed cynicism of those who are trying to strike out the Soviet period of our history and cast a shadow over Lenin.

No one is entitled to violate human laws and fail to reckon with the will of millions of Soviet people, in fulfillment of which the Second Congress of Soviets of the USSR conferred the name of Lenin on the city on the Neva.

The political games over the renaming of Leningrad constitute an attempt by certain forces to disrupt the process of consolidation of society that has begun, provoke a new spiral of confrontation, and distract the people from tackling urgent problems.

We call on Communists and all honest people to say a resolute "no" to the organizers of the unseemly action aimed at renaming Leningrad.

We hope that the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets and the USSR president will express their views.

## Western Republics

### Moldovan Citizens Denied USSR Citizenship

*LD0506221791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2100 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] USSR citizenship is henceforward not allowed for Moldova's citizens. this follows from a law which was passed during the past day by the republic's parliament. The document says that in exceptional cases Moldovan citizenship is granted to citizens of other states by a decision of the republic's president.

### New Prime Minister Cited on Immediate Tasks

*PM0506142991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 91 p 2*

[Correspondent A. Khantsevich report including interview with Prime Minister V.F. Muravskiy in Kishinev; date not given: "Moldova: The Prime Minister Became a Kamikaze. Who Is Prime Minister Now?"]

[Text] Kishinev—One year ago the Moldovan parliament unanimously confirmed as republic prime minister Mircha Druk, a completely unknown sociologist from Chernovitsy. In his program address, Druk stated: "I feel like a kamikaze." Exactly one year on that same parliament passed a majority vote of no confidence in him.

Now the new "star" in the political firmament of sovereign Moldova is Valeriy Muravskiy. At first sight, his ascent seems as swift as his predecessor's. Just one year ago he was working merely as chief of an administration in the republic Ministry of Industrial Construction Materials. In June 1990 he was appointed finance minister and in March this year deputy prime minister.

Analogies between the careers of the two prime ministers are not, however, altogether appropriate. In the former case, there have been frequent changes of profession—from interpreter-cum-guide to director of a commercial association—moves from one city to another, and unpredictable alliances with political movements ranging from "true Leninist" to fevent nationalist and anticommunist. In the latter case you have a high level of professionalism and devotion to the chosen cause. While Druk was raised to the pinnacle of power by the People's Front, representatives of the most diverse deputies' factions voted for Muravskiy's appointment.

Muravskiy did not present yet another extensive program to parliament. Moreover, he repeated twice that very little time had been allotted the present cabinet of ministers. Nevertheless the new prime minister did indicate the ways of extricating the republic from crisis in pretty specific terms. The government, he stated, will adopt the most radical and rigorous measures. It is being demanded that parliament speed up the adoption of laws on privatization, banking and the national bank, the integration of incomes, and local self-management.

The new prime minister is in favor of preserving Moldova's integrity and holding meaningful talks with the Dnestr and Gagauz regions. Asked by one deputy how he regards the dismissal of Russian-language specialists, Muravskiy answered briefly and convincingly that if we in the Finance Ministry had gotten engaged in sorting out interethnic relations there would be nothing today with which to pay even you parliamentarians your salary.

M. Snegur did not need to submit the nomination twice or thrice. With a requirement of 184 votes, Muravskiy's nomination secured the backing of 185 deputies. What will this alignment be like in another year's time?

[Khantsevich] Valeriy Fedorovich, how much time do you have, do you think, to carry out your plans as prime minister?

[Muravski] That depends on two factors—whether circumstances and "external" forces allow us to carry out the reform and, second, how viable and and energetic the actual parliament proves to be.

[Khantsevich] What have you managed to do in the last three days?

[Muravski] I have gotten to know the cabinet of ministers, which has left a contradictory impression so far. It is possible that people are, in turn, sizing me up. I have gotten on closer terms with the president of the republic. Half-a-day has been "taken" by journalists. And yet certain decisions have already been made—on the republic's transport complex, on abolishing the system of rationing from 1 June, and on increasing incentives for the control services; and some cadre questions have been examined. In view of the torrential rain our workers have been sent out to the regions and task forces set up to assist the population. In general, we will be instilling order.

### Ex-Prime Minister Says He Was Removed by Moscow

*OW0506063891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] Moldova's former Prime Minister Mircha Druk has said that Moscow was involved in the endeavors to deprive him of his premiership. "All is decided in Moscow, and the removal of M. Druk was carried out not without help from the center", he told the local trade union weekly "VOCIA POPORUALUY" (The Voice of the People).

According to M. Druk, back in autumn "a high-ranking official from the center" declared that there was no need to worry about the Gagauz republic. "We will dismiss your reckless premier, and all will get settled", he said.

M. Druk said that he sees no possibility of instituting presidency in Moldova and that he stands against the passing of a bill on presidential elections.

According to the ex-prime minister, two things are essential at the moment: To gain independence for Moldova and carry out privatization. "Independence is the key factor in political terms, and privatization in economic terms", he said.

## Caucasus

### Georgian Communists Complain of Harassment

*PM0406155991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 First Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Beginnings of a 'Witch Hunt'?"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 3 Jun—A joint statement issued by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission has listed cases in which the activity of Georgian Communist Party rayon and city committees has been impeded or restricted on the initiative of local prefects. For example, nine rayon and city committees have been evicted from their own premises. The Khonskiy Rayon prefect has issued an order instructing the Communist Party rayon committee to... close itself down.

S. Rigvava, chairman of the Georgian Communist Party Central Control Commission and a member of the republic's Supreme Soviet, writing in the newspaper TSKHOVREBA (Life), commented on the situation in these terms: "In many other rayons the demand 'your job or your party card' has been turned into an action program and the paramount task of prefects. It is surprising that such lawlessness and outrages against people's convictions are committed openly, publicly, and brazenly and that calls to commit these acts are even made on television."

## Shevardnadze Willing To Mediate Ethnic Dispute

*AU0406142191 Paris AFP in English 1354 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] Paris, June 4 (AFP)—Former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze announced here Tuesday that he was ready to mediate in the bitter ethnic dispute between the Soviet Union's Armenians and Azeris. "The conflict has reached boiling point", he warned. Mr. Shevardnadze added that the U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar could also play a part in resolving the problem.

The former minister was in Paris to launch his new book. He also saw French President Francois Mitterand for what was described as a "private" meeting.

At an earlier press conference, Mr. Shevardnadze warned that the Soviet Union was on the verge of anarchy and chaos. The overwhelming priority now, he stated, was for the presidents of all the republics "to work together to bring the country out of this crisis."

In the meantime, the West shouldn't isolate the Soviet Union, as this could lead to a return of a dictatorship, said Shevardnadze. "It's in the West's interest to see stability in the Soviet Union, to help with its development and with perestroika, if possible through economic aid," he said.

With that in mind, the former foreign minister said he favored President Mikhail Gorbachev's participation at the "G-7" (the world's top industrial powers) summit in London next month. "It would be very beneficial for Europe and the world," Mr. Shevardnadze said.

## Georgian President Offers Help

*OW0406050291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 31 May 91*

[Text] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, President of Georgia, voiced concern over rising tension in the border regions of Armenia and Azerbaijan, and the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region. Unfortunately, similar conflicts have recently been provoked in other Trans-Caucasian regions recently, says the presidential statement circulated in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia.

The leadership of Georgia is convinced that the conflict between the two peoples is completely of the Kremlin's making, says the statement.

Zviad Gamsakhurdia urged opposing sides to put an end to the use of force in trying to resolve their problems and start talks to peacefully settle the conflict. He signalled preparedness of his country to mediate in building up the process of dialogue between the two neighboring republics. For that purpose the Georgian President proposed to shortly hold a summit meeting of the Trans-Caucasian republics in Tbilisi.

## Nagorno-Karabakh's Readiness for Dialogue Cited

*NC0506085091 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Jun 91*

[Text] Stepanakert, 4 Jun (ARMENPRES)—The dazzling June sun of the restive skies of Nagorno-Karabakh is no source of joy for the Armenian population of this often-maligned land. The curfew that goes into effect at 2100 during summer, the extreme reduction in the number of flights to Yerevan, and other artificially erected obstacles are having an impact on the psychology of the people.

Undoubtedly, the condition of the residents of Shushinskiy and Gadrutskiy Rayons, who were forcibly deported from their native homes, is the gravest of all. Dozens of residents of Berdadzor gather everyday in front of the oblast soviet executive committee hoping to get permission to return to their ransacked village. However, the military authorities are unable to help the refugees without relevant directives from Moscow. Numerous appeals by the residents of Kirov, Yegtsaog, and Metsshen addressed to higher tribunals requesting the creation of conditions for the return to their places of permanent residence have remained without reply.

The Armenian leadership of the autonomous oblast is seeking for ways to come out of the political crisis. Many in the leadership are coming to the conclusion that a dialogue should be begun with the Azerbaijani side. The main objective of such a move is the speedy restoration of the constitutional organs of power in Nagorno-Karabakh without which it is impossible to stabilize interethnic relations there.

Cables have been sent to the highest national and Azerbaijani authorities bearing the signatures of the chairmen of the oblast, rayon and city soviets executive committees, chairman of the oblast trade-unions federation, and secretaries of the party rayon and city committees. One cable in particular demands an end to bloodshed, plunder, the deportation of the peaceful population, the release of the illegally detained, and the adoption of immediate measures to secure of the return of the deported Armenians to their native villages. The authors of the cable have expressed their readiness to carry out a dialogue with Azerbaijan on the territory of a third republic with the participation of the representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

## Armenia's Sarkisyan on Party's Status, NKAO

*PM0406140591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 p 1*

[Interview with Aram Sarkisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, by A. Ganelin; place, date not given; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction: "Our Man in the Upper Echelons"]

[Text] Yesterday was the first working day for Aram Sarkisyan, the new first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. But he is not new to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, for he has long been known to us. After working as head of a Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee department and as an Armenian Communist Party Central Committee agent, and before becoming PRAVDA's own correspondent and a secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee, Aram was for a long time our own correspondent.

[Ganelin] Aram, you are first secretary, but your office is in the publishing house. Do you want to be closer to your colleagues?

[Sarkisyan] We were simply evicted from the Central Committee building recently. Therefore our temporary shelter now is several offices in the publishing house. We consider that eviction unlawful. It would be fair if we ourselves had control of our property. For we handed over part of our own premises to other organizations last year as it is.

[Ganelin] OK, even though it is in the publishing house rather than the Central Committee building, yet the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee still exists. But are there still people in Armenia who share the ideas of communism?

[Sarkisyan] We have up to 130,000 Communist Party members, and the massive outflow is now over. The independent Communist Party, while defending its people's interests, must attract people. We are concerned both about the question of the Union and about the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. We are against the republic's secession from the USSR, and we believe that it is necessary to preserve the Union in the form of a union of sovereign states.

Communists in the republic are a real political force. We have now advanced the idea of creating a coalition government in the republic in connection with the profound crisis in which Armenia now finds itself.

### Armenians Appeal to Nobel Committee for Help

*OW0606045991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[Text] The Executive Committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies in Stepanakert sent a message to Norway's Nobel Committee on Wednesday, attracting attention to the continuing genocidal practices by Azerbaijan and the Soviet Union against Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh.

The message stresses the point that these practices are taking place with the connivance of President Mikhail Gorbachev, a laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize. It is timed for Gorbachev's arrival in Oslo to deliver a traditional lecture of a Nobel Prize winner.

The message from Stepanakert reiterates the Karabakhi people's appeal to nations of the world to give political asylum on Armenian refugees from Nagorno-Karabakh.

The authors urge the Nobel Committee to facilitate action on this problem.

### Armenian 'Combat' Damage Totals 50 Million Rubles

*LD0506131791 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 5 Jun 91*

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloryan]

[Text] Yerevan June 5 TASS—The damage inflicted on the Armenian economy as a result of recent combat operations in border areas with Azerbaijan has totalled 50 million roubles.

This sum is given in a report by the Armenian State Statistics Committee on direct and indirect losses of the Republican economy early last May. The report was circulated here today.

At that time, the Soviet Army and Interior troops, together with Azerbaijani Interior Ministry special task force, carried out combat operations to implement a decree by the Soviet president to disarm illegal armed groups in Armenia.

As a result of these actions, which were described by the Armenian parliament and government as an "act of aggression and undeclared war", 150 horse and livestock farms, two TV relays and 30 anti-hail systems were destroyed.

The report says that highways, water mains, irrigation systems, power transmission lines and telephone communications were destroyed in areas bordering Azerbaijan, mostly in the Noyemberyan, Goris and Taushi districts.

Agriculture also sustained serious losses. Spring field work was not carried out on 590 hectares of ploughland and 851 hectares of perennial crops due to combat operations and the tense situation.

There was a 220-ton drop in milk yields. Bandits stole and drove 9,200 sheep and 591 cattle to the neighbouring republic.

The losses of work time at Armenian industrial enterprises topped 32,500 man-days during the combat operations. As a result, the Republic lost over two million roubles worth of products, the Statistics Committee reports.